

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Volume III

FALL 1951

Number 4

Modern Literary Scholarship as Reflected in Dante Criticism. By Helmut Hatzfeld.....	289
Cervantes in Nineteenth-Century Russia. By Yakov Malkiel.....	310
The Inez de Castro Theme in European Literature. By Martin Nozick....	330
Dostoïevski et Balzac. By Marthe Blinoff.....	342
Book Reviews	356
<i>The Critic's Notebook</i> , ed by Robert W. Stallman; <i>Critiques and Essays in Criticism, 1920-1948</i> , ed. by Robert W. Stallman; <i>Criticism. The Foundations of Modern Literary Judgment</i> , ed. by Mark Schorer and others (Hoyt Trowbridge). <i>Dizionario Letterario Bompiani</i> (R.W.). <i>The Other World, According to Descriptions in Medieval Literature</i> , by Howard Rollin Patch (Robert O. Payne). <i>Perspectives of Criticism</i> , ed. by Harry Levin (W. K. Wimsatt, Jr.). <i>Dante's Fame Abroad, 1350-1850</i> , by Werner P. Friederich (H. H.). <i>Charles du Bos and English Literature</i> , by Angelo Philip Bertocci (René Picard). <i>French Precursors of the Chanson de Roland</i> , by Mario A. Pei (Ernst Robert Curtius).	
Books Received	379

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON

With the Cooperation of the Comparative Literature
Section of the Modern Language Association
of America

Issued quarterly. Entered as second-class matter, April 5, 1949, at the postoffice at Eugene, Oregon, under act of August 24, 1912.

Comparative Literature

Editor

CHANDLER B. BEALL
University of Oregon
Eugene, Ore.

Associate Editor

WERNER P. FRIEDERICH
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Editorial Board

FRANCIS FERGUSON
Princeton University
Princeton, N. J.

HELMUT HATZFELD
Catholic University
Washington, D. C.

VICTOR LANGE
Cornell University
Ithaca, N. Y.

HARRY LEVIN
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

RENÉ WELLEK
Yale University
New Haven, Conn.

FOUNDED at a time when the strengthening of good international relations is of paramount importance, *Comparative Literature* provides a forum for those scholars and critics who are engaged in the study of literature from an international point of view. Its editors define comparative literature in the broadest possible manner, and accept articles dealing with the manifold interrelations of literatures, with the theory of literature, movements, genres, periods, and authors—from the earliest times to the present. They particularly welcome longer studies on comprehensive topics and on problems of criticism.

Manuscripts, editorial communications, and books for review should be addressed to:
Comparative Literature, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The subscription rate is \$3.50 a year. The price of single copies is \$1.00. Correspondence concerning subscriptions should be addressed to: University of Oregon Publications, Eugene, Oregon. Correspondence concerning exchanges should be addressed to: University of Oregon Library, Eugene, Oregon.

Autres livres à télécharger sur le site
<https://abbassa.wordpress.com>

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

VOLUME III

FALL 1951

NUMBER 4

MODERN LITERARY SCHOLARSHIP AS REFLECTED IN DANTE CRITICISM

HELMUT HATZFELD

THE SIGNIFICANT scholarship concerned with the *Divine Comedy* since 1921, year of the celebration of the six hundredth anniversary of Dante's death, should be of interest even to the non-specialist, since it illustrates so well and so abundantly all the new trends in serious literary criticism. Actually it was in the interpretation of Dante that, for the first time in the history of literary criticism, emphasis was shifted from the study of the background to the study of the work itself, philological minutiae were made subservient to the elucidation of the poetry, the study of structure and unity became paramount, and the decisive differentiation was made between original ideas as such and common ideas originally expressed, i.e., regarded as informing the texture of the artifact. It was there that symbolism and imagery were recognized as determining the degree of poetry in a work, and its mythical proportions; language, style, and metrics were grasped in their psychological function as means of expression; and, finally, the question of intrinsic value, catharsis, poetical persuasion, and assent of the reader were discussed with a view to the problems of a *littérature engagée* versus "art for art's sake."

The shift from the background to the work occurred in the middle of the greatest monograph on the *Divine Comedy* the last generation produced. Its author, Karl Vossler,¹ believed it possible to explain the *Commedia* by fixing its geometrical position in a network of lines from

¹ Karl Vossler, *Die göttliche Komödie. Entwicklungsgeschichte und Erklärung*, 4 vols. (Heidelberg, 1907-10).

history of religion, history of philosophy, history of ethics and politics, history of Old French fiction, Provençal lyricism, and early Italian poetry, as well as from popular, Biblical, and classical influences. But Vossler ended by acknowledging that, despite all this historicogenetic information, nothing was explained of Dante's poetry; and, when he arrived at his fourth volume, he was modest enough to avow that a line-by-line interpretation of each single canto, a translation of each poetical *terzina* into the language of aesthetic criticism, would be more helpful for the understanding than all the heavy artillery of the literary historian with which he had besieged Dante's poetical city throughout three lengthy volumes.

Since it seemed difficult, however, to find the same beauties and the same interest in all of the cantos of the three *cantiche*, it was easy to slip into the opposite error of a subjective interpretation. It was alleged that the power of Dante decreased on the way from the *Inferno* to the *Paradiso*, and that consequently no stylistic unity was maintained throughout the work. Benedetto Croce even believed that the *Commedia* could be split up into truly lyrical passages, revealing the eternal human emotions of love and hatred, joy and grief on the one hand, and, on the other, a dry theological framework, devoid of poetic value, in which no one is interested today.² This overstatement offered a momentous challenge to Dante scholarship. One of its worthiest representatives, M. Barbi, arguing the inacceptability of such an inconsistent compound in the *Commedia*, urged that "What really is of importance, more than anything else, is the [scholarly] understanding of Dante's poetry."³ The commentators⁴ now became aware that commenting did not mean reproducing the possible sources of this or that passage, or the century-long discussions of this or that unsolved problem; their task was rather to trace out the recurrent motifs, and the development of the character and stature of Dante the poetic wanderer, not of Dante the Florentine citizen. It now appeared with a new clarity that the commentator's task was to distinguish as sharply as possible the doctrinal and epic, didactic and descriptive, discursive and emotional, intentions of the poet, the artistic meaning of allusions, similes, and comparisons, the manner of creating spiritual climates through landscapes, dialogue, grouping of persons, harmony between setting, action, and speech, and the like. In other words, the creation

² Benedetto Croce, *La poesia di Dante* (Bari, 1921).

³ Michele Barbi, "Nuovi problemi della critica Dantesca," *Studi Danteschi*, XXIII (1938), 5-77.

⁴ *La Divina Commedia di Dante Alighieri*, commentata da Attilio Momigliano (Florence, 1946). Cf. also the new commentaries by Rivalta (Florence, 1946); Castellino (Turin, Ed. Palatine, 1946); and Liborio Giuffrè, "Esame critico dei commenti alla *Divina Commedia* e proposta d'un nuovo," in his *Nuovi studi danteschi* (Palermo, 1941), pp. 121-144.

of an analytical commentary was to be virtually the adumbration of a synthesis of Dante's art as a spontaneous expression of Dante's mind.

The preoccupation with synthesis and structure which resulted from the new orientation affected the treatment even of apparently isolated questions of philological-historical detail. Let us single out the problem of the identity of the famous *Veltro*, the Greyhound (*Inf.*, I, 101), as an example of the application of the new methods. On the principle that whatever comes from outside the text is irrelevant to its interpretation unless it is supported by some element within the text itself, the commentator now rejects all random guessing in terms of politics and biography—he rejects the idea, for example, that the expected liberator of Italy and the world symbolized by the greyhound might be the German emperor, or a spiritually minded pope, or the Ghibelline leader Uguccione della Faggiuola,⁵ or Dante himself, or Christ at His second coming. The modern Dante scholar does not attempt to search the mind of the historical Dante. He sees no point in declaring the *Veltro* liberator to be a cryptogram for Can Grande della Scala on the grounds that Dante might have translated *cane* (dog) into *veltro* to pay homage to his erstwhile sponsor. Leonardo Olschki,⁶ after a similar, weaker attempt made by Vittorio Cian, rejects the interpretation of the appended words *tra feltro e feltro* as referring to the territorial boundaries of this provincial lord, situated between Feltre and Montefeltro, and refuses therefore to change *feltro* into *feltre* since the grounds for doing so would be wholly arbitrary. It is indeed said of the symbolic *veltro*, whose poetic task is to hunt the *lupa* (she-wolf), “e sua nazione sarà tra feltro e feltro” (*Inf.*, I, 105). This line in Dante's language can only mean, “And his birth will occur between felt and felt.” The astrologically minded Dante can imagine a liberator, whoever he may be, only as born under the most favorable constellation. This is provided by the two influential stars which were identified with the felt-capped Dioscuri, Castor and Pollux, ancient symbols of liberty, i.e., by the constellation Gemini which occurs in May and June, the one *feltro* following (*tra*) the other. This newest interpretation starts from the text, the context, and the oldest commentaries; it is reasonable, and it remains close to Dante's way of thinking; and, what is most important, it does not destroy the poetical symbolism, and it leaves the way open for other liberator-symbols occurring in the *Divine Comedy* to be identified with the same *veltro*. The new interpretation is the product of a philology in the exclusive service of poetics and structural analysis, unwilling to sacrifice objective controls to preconceived speculations.

⁵ Andrea Gustarelli, *Dizionario Dantesco* (Milano, 1946).

⁶ Leonardo Olschki, *The Myth of Felt* (Berkeley, 1949), and Vittorio Cian, *Oltre l'enigma dantesco del veltro* (Turin, 1944).

Structure became the great attraction in Dante studies after structural psychology⁷ discovered that everywhere, and in artifacts particularly, there are textures in which what is happening in the whole cannot be explained by how the single parts are put together; on the contrary, if something happens in a single part, this something is informed by laws of the inner structure of the whole. With this principle in mind, the three apparently different styles of Dante in *Inferno*, *Purgatorio*, and *Paradiso* were seen as only one style varied to conform to the different spirit of each realm and to the gradually purified eyes of Dante. To Dante, Hell appears as a distorted earth⁸ in a corporeal vision, Purgatory as a landscape hovering poetically and theologically between earth and Heaven as though it were an imaginary vision; and Paradise with its brilliant and refulgent spirits reveals itself in the most subtle theological speculations as an intellectual vision for Dante's raptured contemplation. The progression and change of style appears to Ulrich Leo⁹ to be a highly successful achievement of conscious, voluntary, artistic design.

This dynamic progression, however, is further kept in order by the mathematical and geometrical construction of the otherworldly realms, which are in themselves static. The dynamic and the static elements together produce the structural unity of the eschatological atmosphere. It is this transcendental poetical atmosphere that gives unity to the lyrical elements, which according to Mario Rossi¹⁰ would be rather vain if taken apart from their context. Only in their context do they serve emotionally to re-enforce the seriousness of Dante's imagination by giving the improbable a character of verisimilitude, if not of persuasive certitude.¹¹ This persuasion is achieved especially by the reportorial style of the traveler to the other world after his return to earth.¹² It is Dante the reporter's voice that vibrates with compassion for Francesca, with contempt for Filippo Argenti, with admiration for daring Ulysses, and even for the stoic suicide of Cato. But the unifying element in all these lyrical passages is considered by Pietrobono to be Dante's unswerving, objective orientation toward the dogma of the Church.¹³

⁷ M. Wertheimer, *Über Gestalttheorie* (Erlangen, 1925).

⁸ Erich Auerbach, *Dante als Dichter der irdischen Welt* (Berlin, 1929).

⁹ Ulrich Leo, "Sehen und Schauen bei Dante," *Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch*, XI (1929), 183-221. Luigi Tonelli, *Dante e la poesia dell'ineffabile* (Florence, 1934).

¹⁰ Mario Rossi, *Gusto filologico e gusto poetico. Questioni di critica Dantesca* (Bari, 1942).

¹¹ Leo Ferrero, *Appunti sul metodo della Divina Commedia, del dramma, dell'arte classica e decadente* (Capolago, 1940).

¹² R. Palgen, "Die göttliche Komödie als Ich-Erzählung," *Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift*, XXVII (1937), 50-67.

¹³ Luigi Pietrobono, "Struttura, allegoria e poesia nella Divina Commedia," *Giornale Dantesco*, XLIII (1940), 9-45.

Besides this general concern with structure, smaller structural problems have been made, for instance, of the probability that the seventeenth canto of *Purgatorio*, the numerically central song of the *Commedia*, would reveal also the central problem of the whole.¹⁴ Examination did disclose a structural centrality in this canto, where Virgil explains the nature of love at a moment when it becomes clear to the travelers that all types of sinners have mistaken its nature. Those in the circles behind them decidedly loved evil, those in the circles before them were either inordinately attached to creatures or loved the Creator increasingly by becoming detached from creatures. This type of careful structure never turns out to be so pedantically exact that a topographical chart of its details would be possible.¹⁵ The reason is that the deeper structure has been found to be not architectonic but musical. The great leitmotifs of love and the stars moved by love appear, at regular distances, as the quintessence of the unity of Dante's theological-astronomical concept of the cosmos; and they coalesce, in passages where one would not expect them, in the double motif of that love which moves the heavens and all the stars. Thus even Dante's paraphrase of the Credo must contain the central motif of the mover of the heavens who acts out of love: "Io credo in un Iddio Solo ed eterno che tutto il ciel move."¹⁶

The understanding of the unifying elements in the *Commedia* led to an examination of the structural unity of the *Vita Nuova*, supposed to be a chaotic work in which earlier poems were loosely linked together by prose texts to produce a mystifying Platonic love story. But the chaos was disclosed to be a most complex and refined organism, a carefully composed little work of art. And the starting point for the understanding of this unity was the correct concept of the *Vita Nuova* as "renewed life" in the religious sense, and not as "youthful life" in the amorous and Provençal sense.¹⁷

These structural preoccupations have brought new order also into the world of Dante's ideas, making it possible for the first time to separate two problems hitherto not distinguished. First, what were the philosophical convictions of Dante the thinker? For a thinker he certainly wanted to be in his writings on philosophy and politics, the *Convivio* and the *Monarchia*. Second, what were his particular ideas on the philosophy of love and on theology which, given poetical garb in the *Divine Comedy*, inform its symbolism and therefore are more

¹⁴ Hans Rheinfelder, "Der Zentralgesang des Purgatorio und der ganzen Divina Commedia," *Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch*, XXIII (1941), 86-105.

¹⁵ Allen H. Gilbert, "Can Dante's Inferno be Exactly Charted?," *PMLA*, LX (1945), 289-306.

¹⁶ Niccolò Gallo, "Intorno all'unità poetica della Divina Commedia," *Giornale Dantesco*, XXXVIII (1935), 151-168.

¹⁷ J. E. Shaw, *Essays on the Vita Nuova* (Princeton, 1929).

difficult to penetrate than his plainly developed reflections in discursive language? The results of the most careful investigations may be summarized as follows: In his central approach Dante is a scholastic philosopher, not exclusively a follower of St. Thomas, but also, as Martin Grabmann was able to prove,¹⁸ of St. Albert the Great, St. Bonaventure, Petrus de Tarantasia, and Aegidius de Roma. His Thomism, which he learned from a direct pupil of St. Thomas, Fra Remigio de' Girolami, can only be proved in cases where St. Thomas offers an individual teaching different from the common scholasticism of his time. Dante particularly liked St. Thomas' teaching on the fundamental difference between the substance and the faculties of the soul, on spiritual essences existing as pure form without matter, on the pre-eminence of the intellect over the will, and on the beatific vision as the primary and essential element of heavenly glory. Dante's intellectual relations, not only with the Dominicans of Santa Maria Novella (*Convivio*, II, 2) but probably also with the Franciscan Spirituals of Santa Croce and with the Augustinians of Santo Spirito in Florence, account, according to E. Buonaiuti,¹⁹ for his particularly spiritual stressing of love and his Neoplatonic leanings (*Par.*, VII, 39-44). As a direct reader of Aristotle, however, and probably also of the commentary of Averroes, Dante developed for himself a genuine philosophy which stresses, more than that of most schoolmen, the importance of the secular life. Thus Dante became, as Gilson²⁰ says, the philosopher of the two beatitudes and of a world empire subordinated to the Church in rank and dignity but not in legal authority, having its own law, like the Church herself, directly from God. In a similar selective fashion, as Bruno Nardi has it,²¹ he developed a philosophy of love which tries to reconcile earthly and heavenly love, the former being conducive to the latter in developing the spirit of sacrifice. This point, however, is inseparable from the problem of Beatrice, which will be dealt with later.

None of the Western philosophers and theologians, however, offered Dante a scheme of eschatology elaborate enough to furnish the outlines of his *Commedia*. It seems improbable that he could have constructed, without aid, from doctrinal hints only—the eschatological part is lacking in the *Summa Theologica*—or from poor and truncated Western folklore the whole concept of his other world. A purgatorial hill surmounted by the earthly paradise, a beloved Lady leading the

¹⁸ Martin Grabmann, "Die Wege von Thomas von Aquin zu Dante. Fra Remigio de' Girolami, O.P.," *Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch*, IX (1925), 1 ff.; and "Thomas von Aquin und die Dante-Auslegung," *ibid.*, XXV (1943), 4-24.

¹⁹ E. Buonaiuti, *Dante come profeta* (Modena, 1936).

²⁰ Etienne Gilson, *Dante the Philosopher* (London, 1948).

²¹ Bruno Nardi, *Dante e la cultura medievale* (Bari, 1942).

lover to the Almighty, infernal guardians obstructing and persecuting the travelers, the smallness of the cosmos viewed from Heaven, the distribution of the blessed throughout the spheres, the most hellish torture by ice instead of fire—all of these imaginations seemed so distinctly Arabic-Mohammedan motifs, that Asín's hypothesis of Muslim eschatology in Dante,²² stressed recently by Cerulli, was adopted by serious scholars. Since, on the other hand, no truly doctrinal influence from Avicenna or Averroes could be proved, it became clear how ingeniously Dante the poet could use non-Christian material for structural and fictional purposes without thereby becoming in the slightest degree a heterodox philosopher or theologian.

His own philosophy, of course, is by design subordinated to his fiction. Dante seems little concerned with the fights of the schoolmen on earth in his poetical creation, where he assumes the character of a prophet and visionary rather than that of a philosopher. Not only St. Thomas and St. Francis are met in Heaven by Dante, but also the Averroist Siger of Brabant and Joachim of Flora (who dreamed of a merely spiritual Church). Both Siger and Joachim went to extremes in order to keep the different domains pure from undue mixtures and infringements, exactly what St. Thomas and Dante were striving for. Siger is now considered by E. Gilson to be simply a symbol, more drastic than St. Thomas himself, of the separation of philosophy from theological speculations, and Joachim a symbol, more drastic than St. Francis, of an ideal Church of poverty, aloof from the world, abstaining from political interference in the secular domain of the state, and in return unhampered by the emperor or the king of France.

Other investigations demonstrate how overwhelmingly Dante illustrates by means of fictional characters the fundamental scholastic teachings of moral philosophy. Ulysses is shown (*Inf.*, XXVI) exploring the seas with a daring spirit in order to discover new realms until one day he is shipwrecked and drawn to the depth of the sea and to Hell. The older interpretation conceived this Ulysses as a pre-Columbus, a tragic hero. The modern interpretation of Hugo Friedrich,²³ however, is this: No sinner is a tragic hero with Dante. Dante blames Ulysses in accordance with St. Augustine (*Conf.*, X, 35), "For greed of knowledge's sake do we see people sail to the uttermost

²² Miguel Asín Palacios, *La escatología musulmana en la Divina Comedia seguida de la historia y crítica de una polémica* (Madrid-Granada, 1943). Asín's thesis was corroborated by Enrico Cerulli, *Il 'Libro della Scala' e la questione delle fonti arabo-spagnuole della Divina Commedia* (Città del Vaticano, 1949). See also Leonardo Olschki, "Mohammedan Eschatology and Dante's Other World," *CL*, III (1951), 1-17.

²³ Hugo Friedrich, *Die Rechtsmetaphysik der göttlichen Komödie* (Frankfurt, 1942).

boundaries of the earth," and in accordance with St. Thomas' teaching, "Curiositas non est studiositas, sed immoderata rerum cognitio" (*Summa*, II^a, II^{ae}, Qu. 166, Art. 2). The principle at issue is this: divine justice punishes the misguided will, the root of the action; the action itself may contain elements open to human pity.

The largest vistas have been opened in the reinterpretation of Dante's symbolism. To state first briefly what is at issue here, we may say that two extreme views have been entirely abandoned: the didactic theory that Dante's *Commedia* represents an allegory like the *Roman de la Rose* (and its epitome *Il Fiore*, which because of its pedestrian presentation alone, according to O. A. Schmidt, cannot be attributed to Alighieri²⁴), and the mystical theory (Romano Guardini) that Dante's symbolic journey represents a real vision, a supernatural experience on the part of its author. A third interpretation takes Dante's fictional eschatological dream-vision as an analogical and implied ascetico-mystical purgation, illumination, and union.²⁵ This, however, raises the question whether the literal eschatological sense of the *Commedia*, now accepted by all serious Dante scholars, is still open to embellishment by further senses—either the allegorical, moral, and anagogical sense of Biblical exegesis or esoteric hidden senses which Dante might have had in mind. The answer today is this: The four-fold Biblical meaning seems out of the question to those who believe the famous letter to Can Grande to be spurious. Petrobono has made it seem probable, for twenty good reasons, that Letter XIII to Can Grande could not have been written by Dante the theologian (with reference to St. Thomas, *Quaest. quodlibet.*, Qu. VII, Art. 16) despite its appearance in the *Testo Critico*.²⁶

Not convinced by these reasons, Charles S. Singleton,²⁷ preferring the allegorical sense of the theologian as expressed in Letter XIII to the allegorical sense of the poet as discussed in the *Convivio*, solves the problem by not overstressing the metaphorical senses, by restricting them to the action rather than to the characters, and by not clinging to them pedantically.

The esoteric meanings have a chance of being admitted whenever they seem justified by the structure of the poem as well as by the literary sociology of the circle of Dante and his friends. The most important point of the modern critics, however, is that recourse to any other sense than the literal one, suggested by a spontaneous fic-

²⁴ Otto A. Schmidt, "Ein neues Argument in der Fiore Frage," *Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch*, XIX (1937), 27-28.

²⁵ M. Grace Monahan, "Dante's Perception of the Soul's Purgation," *Ursuline Tradition and Progress*, IV (1944), 23-40.

²⁶ Luigi Petrobono, "L'epistola a Can Grande," *Giornale Dantesco*, XL (1937), 1-51.

²⁷ C. S. Singleton, "Dante's Allegory," *Speculum*, XXV (1950), 78-86.

tional event or character, can be admitted only if the situation would otherwise remain obscure and unintelligible.

The denial of strictly didactic allegories in Dante's *Divine Comedy* need not conflict with the fact that Dante himself uses allegories and explains them in his philosophical writings, as when in the *Convivio* he calls the *donna gentile* philosophy, her smile the philosophical persuasion, and her eyes the philosophical demonstrations.²⁸ However, to introduce such appended, accommodated allegories into the *Commedia* when confronted with Beatrice's smile and sparkling eyes would jeopardize the whole artistic understanding of the *poema sacro*. Even where in the *Divine Comedy* Dante speaks, as a poet, of piercing the veil and helping a little in the interpretation, it has been argued by A. Camilli that he is to be thoroughly mistrusted as endangering his own creation by an out-of-place and certainly feigned exegesis.²⁹ According to this critic it is a sound principle never to exceed the literal sense of an accepted symbol. Even in cases of dire necessity, where a character behaves in such a way that passing over to an allegorical sense becomes imperative, we should return to the literal meaning as soon as possible. During such allegorical excursions, however, one may be sure that there is no other, literal sense involved besides the allegorical one. It is then as with the Cantic of Canticles as a whole, according to the traditional Catholic interpretation: the only meaning is the metaphorical one. Such a metaphorical passage, obviously, is the first canto of the *Inferno*, where the *selva oscura* with the three animals belongs to quite another realm of existence than Virgil, Hell, and the demons. Only recently this metaphor was traced by J. H. Whitfield to Horace, *Satires*, II, 3:

As in woods where often
The wanderers by error are driven from their path.³⁰

In passages where, as in the Cantic, the allegorical sense is the literal one, the reader is even less entitled to ask extratextual and biographical questions, such as whether the dark wood means heresy, or fornication, or pursuit of worldly honors in Dante's life, or whether the leopard means Florence and the lion Charles of Valois. These questions refer only to potentialities, namely, Dante's life as raw material, and abandon the actually achieved world of Dante's poetical symbolism. In other words, the new Dante interpretation makes a strong point of the fact that Dante in his poetry (not in his prose) overcomes the usual mediaeval allegorism and fuses personal, theological, political, moral, even astronomical elements into symbols of a

²⁸ Bruno Nardi, *Nel mondo di Dante* (Rome, 1944).

²⁹ A. Camilli, "Le figurazioni allegoriche," *Studi Danteschi*, XXVIII (1949), 197-215, summarizing his earlier studies on this subject.

³⁰ J. H. Whitfield, *Dante and Virgil* (Oxford, 1949), p. 74.

decidedly poetical and not didactic quality.³¹ This interpretation may go beyond the mark, but its laudable implication is clear, namely that whoever uses the word allegory for Dante's symbolism must keep in mind that his is an *allegoria ante rem*, not *in re*. The serpent which threatens the poor souls before their entrance into Purgatory in the Valley of the Princes is no more and no less an allegory than the serpent of old, representing Satan in the earthly paradise in front of Eve. It is merely a substitute for the *leo rugiensi* of the Compline, as the souls pray: "Te lucis ante terminum." If there is allegory, even "exchanged" allegory, it is primarily in Dante's Christian tradition, not in Dante's poetic creation.

Here certainly Charles Singleton's question ought to be asked: Was Dante capable of creating and willing to create his own myth within the limits of the world of Christian revelation?³² Singleton would say yes insofar as the personal symbolic creations of Dante are of the same "convincing" kind as those of Genesis. His poetry gives the awesome answer the prophet gives when the philosopher is reduced to silence. Dante as prophet, however, is identical with Plato's ideal poet who supplies myths as a means of illustrating truth, eschatological, moral, and metaphysical—a poet whose lies are true in a deeper sense. Dante's own mythical success within the frame of Christian revelation and Catholic dogma reflects that subjective effort which has become classical because every convinced Christian would create it in similar fashion, if he were a poet—a spiritual reality more real than Plato's realm of ideas.

Quite different from the question of Dante's mythical symbolism, which represents the allegory of poet and theologian in an indissoluble phenomenon, is the question whether the symbols of Dante do not contain psychological overtones, the re-evocation of which means for the critic a deeper penetration of the artifact. The ascent of Mount Purgatory with its striving and hoping conveys to the reader, according to Theophil Spoerri,³³ all the trouble and thrill of mountain climbing: "effort at the outset, loftiness on the heights, heat at noon and rest at night, unrest in the mist and liberation when the view is widening." Such symbolic trimmings, however, are typical of critics who refuse to believe in the literal sense of Dante's work and have recourse from the

³¹ Luigi Pietrobono, "Allegoria o arte?" *Giornale Dantesco*, XXXVII (1936), 95-134, and "L'allegorismo e Dante," *ibid.*, XXXVIII (1937), 85-102, versus Tommaso Ventura, *Nuovi orizzonti della Divina Commedia* (Rome, 1907, 2nd ed., 1941); and T. Lucrezio Rizzo, *Allegoria, allegorismo e poesia nella Divina Commedia* (Milan, 1941).

³² Charles S. Singleton, "Dante and Myth," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, X (1949), 482-502.

³³ Theophil Spoerri, *Einführung in die göttliche Komödie* (Zürich, 1946), p. 149.

outset to the "allegory of the poet." Actually, Spoerri believes only in the moral sense of the *Divine Comedy*.

But there remains a final question concerning Dante's symbolism. Sometimes the symbols have an allusional character. Therefore they may remain dark if one does not consider that Dante was writing for a circle of well-bred ladies and gentlemen who shared the same ideas on love and politics. This thesis is generally accepted. About the precise character of this literary circle, however, opinions differ. To some this group is simply a circle of friends who have "intelligence of love" and who, coming from the law school of Bologna, continued at Florence the troubadour cult which once spread through the castles of Provence—in a form adapted to the Italian high bourgeoisie. To others this group seems to continue the half-fabulous French Courts of Love; to still others it appears as a sect tinged with an Albigenian type of heterodoxy and called *Fedeli d'amore*; finally by others again these Faithful of Love are restored to orthodoxy and appear as the wealthy and aristocratic-minded third order of the Knights Templar. If modern Dante scholarship takes these theories of literary sociology seriously, it is again for ergocentric reasons. They make much clearer certain stylistically obscure symbols.

Dante, for instance, is supposed to have expressed the political thought of this group that the world is going astray because the Church and the Empire have confused their domains. This he expressed, according to Luigi Valli,³⁴ by emblems, symbolizing the Church by the Cross and the Empire by the Eagle, as recurrent separate and joint (e.g., *Purg.*, VIII, 85) motifs in the *Commedia*. Robert L. John³⁵ even discovered that the Cross combined with the Eagle was the coat of arms of the great master of the Knights Templar and might have inspired the thirty symmetrical passages of the *Commedia* where this symbol is used directly or is translated into new symbols. Thus, in view of Dante's philosophy of the two beatitudes, the symbolism and structure of the *Divine Comedy* appear to the scrutinizing eye of the critic as a poetically draped syllogism of the following kind. Major: The Eagle is as necessary to earthly bliss as the Cross is to heavenly bliss. Minor: The earthly paradise is the necessary passage on the road to Heaven, as actually is the case in the architecture of the *Commedia*. Consequently: The Eagle of the World Empire is necessary in order to guarantee a maximum chance for all to reach the celestial Paradise.

The Knights Templar theory of John can solve better than any other

³⁴ Luigi Valli, *Il segreto della Croce e dell'Aquila* (Bologna, 1922); *Il linguaggio segreto di Dante e dei 'Fedeli d'Amore'*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1928-30); and Francesco Egidi, "Guittone d'Arezzo, i Frati Gaudenti e i 'Fedeli d'Amore,'" *Nuova rivista storica*, XXI (1937), 158-195.

³⁵ Robert L. John, *Dante* (Vienna, 1946). See also Ernst Robert Curtius, "Neue Dante Studien," *Romanische Forschungen*, LX (1947), 237-289.

theory certain problems of particularly obscure symbolism. Let us select three knotty ones: Geryon, the Ancient of Crete, and, most obscure of all, the number, five hundred and fifteen.

When Dante with Virgil comes to the rim of the seventh circle of Hell, the wanderers find that there is no path down to the eighth. Virgil makes clear to Dante that they will use the flying monster Geryon, who must, however, be called from the depths of the abyss. Virgil takes the cord with which Dante is girded, goes a little around the circle until he comes to a group of Florentine usurers, and throws Dante's cord from this particular spot into the abyss; and immediately the monster Geryon moves to the place from which the cord has been thrown. This cord cannot be, as Dantologists have believed, the Franciscan cord, because this is always called *capestro* by Dante (*Inf.*, XXVII, 42; *Par.*, XI, 87; *Par.*, XII, 132) and not *corda*; nor can it be the Dominican *lumbare*, as Mandonnet would have it, because neither the one nor the other is a symbol of chastity, which Dante declares his cord to be. The only *corda* that is a symbol of chastity is the belt of the Knights Templar. Furthermore, Virgil throws the cord from the particular place occupied by Florentine usurers such as the Gianfigliuzzi and the Obriachi (*Inf.*, XVII, 70). Geryon being one of them in kind and the most monstrous one, Fraud in person as Dante says, is attracted by the signal which appears to come from the usurers. The Florentine bankers of the fourteenth century were instrumental in the condemnation and fall of the Knights Templar, and one of them, Noffo Dei, was their main accuser. He is supposed to have been Dante's model for Geryon; he was later accused and hanged in Paris. Dante's sympathy with the Templars, therefore, has condensed this story into a whole sequence of symbols, including the fact that the cord of innocence has become an instrument in the process of killing Fraud.

More convincing still is the explanation of the Ancient of Crete (*Inf.*, XIV, 94-120). Crete was the island where Aeneas was shipwrecked when carrying the Roman Eagle and where St. Paul was stranded when carrying the Cross to Rome. Dante's statue of the Ancient of Crete, a monument of catastrophes, now turns his back to Damiatta, weeping over the fall of this last bastion of the Templars, and looks towards Rome, most probably inquiring whether a spiritual pope will not arise there who will restore the Templars, suspended by Clement V at the wish of Philip the Fair of France.

Finally, the liberator who in the *Inferno* was called *Veltro*, is called in the earthly paradise "a five hundred and fifteen" (*un cinquecento diece e cinque*, *Purg.*, XXXIII, 43) in the apocalyptic style of St. John, who speaks of "a six hundred and sixty-six" (Rev. 13:18), whom the exegetes used to identify with the Roman emperor Nero. The commentators have either explained Dante's number as a cryptic

riddle (*DXV*) which, with some shifting of its Roman characters could be read as *Dux*, leader, or have translated the name of Can Grande della Scala, supposed to be the *Dux*, into Greek characters and identified each of them with cabalistic values. Now, five hundred and fifteen, actually, is the year in which Zorobabel built the second temple in Jerusalem and consequently, Robert L. John points out, would represent a very reasonable symbol for the spiritual pope, restorer or second builder of the destroyed temple of the Order of the Knights Templar. The new interpretations of *Veltro* and *cinquecento diece e cinque* in no way contradict what was earlier said of the generally nonobscure character of Dante's symbolic language, because in both cases the texts must be cryptic and apocalyptic for stylistic reasons, since they record dark prophecies of Virgil and Beatrice, respectively.

Dantologists who until recent times seemed to be sure that Virgil was a symbol only for reason, the *lumen rationale*, human wisdom, philosophy, the natural means towards happiness or metaphysical knowledge,³⁶ overlooked the point that Aristotle, "the master of those who know," would have enacted this role with far more proper credentials. Those who said that Virgil is Dante's guide mainly in language and style were not aware that Virgil's ideal of style is just the opposite of Dante's;³⁷ furthermore, Dante's imitations of Virgil, whenever they occur, smack a little of the mediaeval *Aeneid* commentary of Bernardus Silvestris and the *Poetics* of John of Garland.³⁸ Those who stressed the patriotic connotations of Dante the Italian, who feels himself a Roman and sees himself in an uninterrupted line with Virgil, were wrong in coloring their interpretation with considerations of race, nation, and national state.

Virgil is for Dante, as the recent investigations of Whitfield underscore, the prophet of the birth of Christ in his fourth eclogue, and the singer of the Roman Eagle at a moment when the Cross is about to sanctify it. In his time all things seemed to converge toward an eternal Pax Romana and toward a vaguely envisioned Church protected by the might of imperial Rome. Virgil, therefore, as a guide, orients Dante mainly in reconducting the Empire to the ideal balance which Virgil had dimly foreseen, which was realized for a short time under Constantine, and which was destroyed by the Donation of Constantine. This, Whitfield thinks, is the main reason why Virgil is entitled to guide Dante to the earthly paradise.

³⁶ G. Galassi Paluzzi, "Perchè Dante scelse Virgilio a sua guida," *Giornale Dantesco*, XXXIX (1936), 287-307; and Mario Casella, *Le guide di Dante nella Divina Commedia* (Florence, 1944).

³⁷ J. H. Whitfield, *op. cit.*

³⁸ E. R. Curtius, *op. cit.*, pp. 256 and 247.

As for the much more difficult problem of Beatrice, no appreciable contribution can be said to have been made by the so-called realists who saw in Beatrice the transfigured Florentine lady, Beatrice Portinari, who died in 1290 at twenty-four as the wife of Simone de' Bardi, or by the symbolists who saw in her divine wisdom and grace. The new Beatrice, a poetical myth like Virgil, is according to her name the one who leads to happiness, *la donna salutifera*; she has an existence of importance only in poetry, not in life.

It is significant that the early commentators, on whom the new Dantologists rely so much, do not mention the name of Portinari. The critics of today try to discard, as a fact, Dante's meeting with the nine-year-old girl, as described in the *Vita Nuova*, while they would admit as a maximum concession a troubadour-like but rejected homage on the part of Dante to the wife of Simone de' Bardi.³⁹ The connotation of Bardi's wife, however, proves to be detrimental to any function of Beatrice in the *Divine Comedy*.⁴⁰ Charles S. Singleton's⁴¹ newest interpretation pertinently starts from the structure of the *Vita Nuova*. Here Dante tried to solve the old problem of the troubadours as to whether carnal love is compatible with Christian charity and can lead to God. The classical troubadours, having made the lady herself a goddess, usually recanted in their later years the sinful love they had sung. Guido Cavalcanti and his circle tried to make of their lady the angelic creature, *la donna angelicata*, who had to be Platonically and tragically renounced because she was unattainable.

Dante changed the pattern. His Beatrice first makes him happy with her greeting. He enjoys the slightest token of earthly love. When this creature who bestows happiness refuses to greet him again, the great lover continues none the less to sing her praise like the other troubadours, but without their note of wailing and self-pity. He is on the way to a higher love which has sacrificial elements because it makes one forget self. Then comes the tremendous blow. Beatrice dies, and her lover sees the way free to give his love direction toward God alone. His love has become charity. Beatrice is thus revealed retrospectively as a kind of charity incarnate, an analogy of proportion to Christ Himself, the way to Him in the order of rightness which does not need recantation—a Beatrice who by slight but painful detours leads to God,

³⁹ Rudolf Borchardt, *Epilogomena zu Dante*, I. *Einleitung in die Vita Nuova* (Berlin, 1923).

⁴⁰ Michele Barbi, "La questione di Beatrice," *Problemi di critica dantesca*, first series (Florence, 1934), pp. 113-139; and Luigi Pietrobono, "Realità e idealità nella 'Vita nuova,'" *Giornale Dantesco*, XLII (1939), 107-118; and Luigi Valli, *Il linguaggio segreto*, p. 411.

⁴¹ Charles S. Singleton, *An Essay on the Vita Nuova* (Cambridge, Mass., 1949); see also his "Dante's Comedy: The Pattern at the Center," *Romanic Review*, XLII (1951), 169-177.

not by the impracticable devices of an impossible Platonism, but in the radical Christian sense. She gives the taste for sacrificial love and steps aside. When the *Commedia* opens she shows Dante, who had relapsed, the horrors of sin (horrible because destructive of charity), procures for him illumination by the visions of glory, leads him to the master of contemplation, St. Bernard, steps aside again, and has him conducted by the real pattern of created charity, Mary, to Christ and to the Holy Trinity. Singleton's concept of Beatrice solves all the difficulties of interpretation. One of his predecessors, Umberto Cianiolo,⁴² pointed out that before Beatrice's final disappearance she was eclipsed twice when the direct radiance of God's loving light made Dante forget her presence, once in the sphere of the sun where the refulgent group of saintly theologians outshines the light of Beatrice, and once in the highest sphere when Dante looks at the overwhelming charity of the disciple of love, St. John.

Thus the new Beatrice is a Christlike charity incarnate. Designate her as you will—revealed truth, faith, supernatural order, spiritual church, sanctifying grace, theology, perfection, sanctity, or any other element in Dante's poetical-theological system—she remains the beloved woman of a poem, primarily love, but supernatural love which is the culmination of Christianity, the virtue which remains in eternity, the union between God and man.

In close conjunction with this new interpretation of Beatrice has come a solution of the so-called problem of the *dolce stil nuovo*. Not one of Dante's predecessors, not even Guinicelli or Cavalcanti,⁴³ but Dante himself is the inventor of this style,⁴⁴ the man who disentangled the knot, as Bonagiunta da Lucca⁴⁵ says. Being a spirit in Purgatory, Bonagiunta knows what the true *intelletto d'amore* (*Purg.*, XXIV) is. This sweet new style is considered by recent scholars not as a rhetorical mannerism but the very heart of Christian love poetry. Charles Singleton has seen still more clearly what Bonagiunta's words mean:

Io veggio ben come le vostre penne
Diretto al dittator sen vanno strette.

(*Purg.*, XXIV, 58, 59)

Clearly I see how closely do your pens
Follow on him who dictates from within you.

(Lawrence Grant White)

⁴² Umberto Cianiolo, "La carità dottrinale di Dante," *Giornale Dantesco*, XL (1937), 125-139.

⁴³ Francesco Biondolillo, *Dante creatore del dolce stil nuovo* (Palermo, 1937).

⁴⁴ Ruggero M. Ruggieri, "Dante e il dolce stil nuovo," *Giornale Dantesco*, XXXIX (1936), 181-196.

⁴⁵ J. E. Shaw, "Dante and Bonagiunta," *Report of the Dante Society* (Cambridge, Mass., Apr. 1936).

Again this dictator is not Amore, the pagan Cupid, but uncreated Caritas, the Holy Spirit, infusing the spirit of love into the truly Christian love poets. Dante actually copied a passage from the mystic, Richard of Saint Victor: "Solus digne loquitur qui secundum quod cor dictat verba componit."⁴⁶ The implication is that Dante, conversing with Bonagiunta, feigns to be hearing for the first time about his decisive poetic achievement—continuing his assumed role from the *Vita Nuova*, the role of a glosser on providential events worked out by God, who made of him also an instrument of His praise, a praise condensed in Beatrice, *loda di dio, beata, benedetta, gloriosa*, heavenly love hidden in the garb of troubadour love. Singleton's contribution to the solution of the problem seems conclusive.

That Dante was conscious of technical stylistic problems has not been overlooked in this age of investigation of style. Examination of the problems of structure and symbol and the new concept of Beatrice have naturally shed new light on Dante's vocabulary. To keep Dante's symbolic rivers in line with his symbolic woods and hills, it had to be pointed out that his *fiumana ove 'l mar non ha vanto* (*Inf.*, II, 108) is of the same "geography" as St. Augustine's *fluctus concupiscentiae* and Hugh of St. Victor's *lacus cordis*.⁴⁷ But *fonte, fontana, fiume, rio, saluto, salute, pietra, sasso, marmo, tempio, amore, cor gentil, morte, vita, fiore, rosa* also receive different meanings under the impact of the new theories.⁴⁸ Dante's verbal creation was brought into the limelight by T. Spoerri,⁴⁹ who stressed his impressive word formations—*inurbarsi, insemprarsi, inluarsi, imparadisarsi*—but much more so by Malagoli,⁵⁰ who discovered a nominal principle in Dante's manner of using suggestive words and locutions which create by themselves visualization, space, and relief (*frontalità*).

Passionate scenes, it has been observed, are stylistically framed by Dante's anaphorical habit of repeating words and phrases at the beginning of consecutive tercets.⁵¹ Curtius⁵² has discovered that the Middle Latin use of serious wordplay, the so-called *annominatio* and *figura etymologica* of the type, *Cred'io ch'ei credette ch' io credesse* (*Inf.*, XIII, 25), was used by Dante with measure and in such an inconspicuous way that it appears only like a thin ornament—whereas the metonymical allusions of the type, *L'infamia di Creti* (*Inf.*, XII,

⁴⁶ Singleton, *An Essay on the Vita Nuova*, pp. 90 ff.

⁴⁷ Charles S. Singleton, "Sulla fiumana ove 'l mar non ha vanto," *Romanic Review*, XXXIX (1948), 269-277.

⁴⁸ Luigi Valli, *Linguaggio segreto*, p. 423.

⁴⁹ Spoerri, *op. cit.*, pp. 298 f.

⁵⁰ Luigi Malagoli, *Linguaggio e poesia nella Divina Commedia* (Genoa, 1949).

⁵¹ O. M. Johnston, "Repetition of Words and Phrases at the Beginning of Consecutive Tercets in Dante's Divine Comedy," *PMLA*, XXIX (1919), 448 ff.

⁵² Curtius, *op. cit.*, pp. 272, 264.

12), for the Minotaur appear on every page as periphrases of dignity and sublimity and as a means of communion, of sophisticated connivance, with the cultured reader who knows so much about rhetoric, antiquity, history, and mythology. The *raison d'être* of Dante's other figures of speech is under investigation,⁵³ particularly the fusing of troubadour elements and liturgical patterns of the type, *La gloria di colui che tutto move*,⁵⁴ and his superior imitation of earlier eulogies.⁵⁵

As far as speech styles are concerned, Spitzer⁵⁶ has seen that the plant-man Pier della Vigna (*Inf.*, XIII) not only speaks the stilted language of a courtier but also that of an amphibious being, and that farcical elements in the grotesque scenes of *Inf.*, XXI-XXIII inform speech, movement, gestures, and names of devils alike.⁵⁷ We have learned⁵⁸ that, when Dante is embarrassed, as with Farinata and Cavalcanti's father in the circle of the heresiarchs, Tuscanisms escape him as an expression of this embarrassment before he can find the correct literary term. When Cavalcanti, the father, uses (*Inf.*, X, 69) an unusual form *lome* for *lume*, he does not do so, as has been shown by H. Kuen⁵⁹ (refuting Meyer-Lübke), because Dante was in need of an adequate rime, but because this very form occurs in one of the famous poems of Cavalcanti, the son, whose memory he wants to honor. When the dignity of the interlocutor demands the sublime, high, and tragic style of address, Virgil does the talking instead of Dante.⁶⁰ Introductory formulas to direct speeches in the *Commedia* have been compared to those in the *Aeneid* and found to be much richer, although patterned on the *Aeneid*.⁶¹

Leitmotifs which hitherto had escaped notice have been singled out. Such is the motif of light in Purgatory which, during the quest for peace and protection, becomes stronger and stronger with the cleans-

⁵³ T. A. Fitzgerald, "Dante's Figures of Speech," *Italica*, XVIII (1941), 120-123; and F. Maggini, "Associazioni etimologiche nelle immagini di Dante," *Lingua nostra*, VI (1944-45), 25-28.

⁵⁴ Helmut Hatzfeld, "Das Heilige im dichterischen Sprachausdruck des *Paradiso*," *Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch*, XII (1930), 41-70; Erich Staedler, "Analekten zur römischen Messliturgie in der Divina Commedia," *ibid.*, XXIV (1942), 131-158.

⁵⁵ E. Auerbach, "Dante's Prayer to the Virgin and Earlier Eulogies," *Romance Philology*, III (1949), 1-26.

⁵⁶ Leo Spitzer, "Speech and Language in *Inferno* XIII," *Italica*, XXIX (1942), 81-104.

⁵⁷ Leo Spitzer, "The Farcical Elements in *Inferno* XXI-XXIII," *MLN*, LIX (1944), 83-88.

⁵⁸ Whitfield, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

⁵⁹ H. Kuen, "Dante in Reimnot," *Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift*, XXX (1940), 305-314.

⁶⁰ Angelo Lipari, "Parla tu, questi è Latino," *Italica*, XXIII (1946), 73-81.

⁶¹ Erich Staedler, "Die Wendungen zur Einführung der direkten Rede in der *Divina Commedia* und ihre klassischen Vorbilder," *Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch*, XXV (1943), 106-124.

ing of the heart.⁶² Leitmotifs have been studied also in their musical arrangement from their first *intonazione*, through their *ripresa*, to their final appearance, as in the case of the resounding water of the eighth circle of the *Inferno*.⁶³ Metaphors for hunger and thirst have been recognized as a systematic ladder conducting to the heavenly food of the angels.⁶⁴

The stylistic reason for the vividness of Dante's descriptions is found in that tone which brings the strange and the visionary down to the level of the familiar; Dante's humble style elements are recognized as partly naturalistic. He does not shrink from presenting ugly things as ugly, as when the flatterers are described as plunged in human excrement (*Inf.*, XVIII, 113-117).⁶⁵ His more lofty realism, however, has been compared to that of Giotto for its penetration of the secrets of nature and its plastic evidence, through which glows a deep Franciscan religiosity.⁶⁶ Dante's language from a euphonic viewpoint is seen as the expression of the particular spiritual climate of the different episodes: fear is expressed by stammering, horror by purposely misplaced accents, erotic passion by labials as though they reproduced kisses, satanic malignity by the absence of soft consonants.⁶⁷ This is the contribution of the age of phonemics to Dantology. Dante's range of style is considered incomparable; it is *umile, dolce, bello, soave, alto, sublime*, classical, Biblical, abstract, veristic, mixed, according to the situation described.⁶⁸ It includes the minutest detailed elaboration of vowel combinations, accents, pause, period structure, and other syntactical patterns. We have acquired in recent years a mass of information on Dante's language and style, still scattered, however, and not united in a synthesis.

As for Dante's verse, the *endecasillabo*, its origin from the Sapphic meter has been established.⁶⁹ Precisely this origin has suggested that there are different metrical overtones, according to the circumstances, hovering above the regular architecture of the *cantus firmus* of the iambic succession of unstressed and stressed syllables. Such an alternative principle is the basis of any type of Romance verse. It was Martha Amrein-Widmer⁷⁰ who discovered the psychological meaning of these

⁶² Spoerri, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

⁶³ A. Momigliano, *Edizione commentata della Divina Commedia*, I, 117.

⁶⁴ Walter Naumann, "Hunger und Durst als Metaphern bei Dante," *Romanische Forschungen*, LIV (1940), 12-36.

⁶⁵ Whitfield, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

⁶⁶ Achille Bertoni Calosso, "Giotto e lo stil nuovo," *Rassegna Italiana*, XX (1937).

⁶⁷ Spoerri, *op. cit.*, pp. 53, 56, 76, 134.

⁶⁸ Curtius, *op. cit.* p. 250; and E. Auerbach, *Mimesis* (Bern, 1949), *passim*, and pp. 171-195.

⁶⁹ Spoerri, *op. cit.*, pp. 361-388.

⁷⁰ Martha Amrein-Widmer, *Rhythmus als Ausdruck inneren Erlebens in Dantes Divina Commedia* (Zürich, 1932).

hovering meters. The iambic, monotonous regularity itself is used in its military correctness when orderly marching is expressed:

Poi fummo fatti soli procedendo
 u - u - u - u - u - u

The harrassing and hurrying disturbance of one-syllable words marks the plight of the sinners of the flesh driven around eternally by the storm of their passion like leaves by a tempest:

Di qua, di là, di giù, di su li mena.

Liturgical solemnity characterizes the prayer which actually reproduces the cursus of the *orationes* under the guise of the Sapphic meter:

O padre nostro che nei cieli stai
 u - u - u / u u - u -
 Vergine madre, figlia del tuo figlio
 - u u - u / - u u u - u

A long caesura suggests a bliss to be retained and tasted:

Io son Beatrice // che ti faccio andare.

Hundreds of these psychological-metrical variations have been analyzed. One is even inclined to believe that Dante worked out all these patterns consciously.⁷¹

The detailed imagery of Dante, as distinct from his general symbolism, has undergone the deepest probing. His images are no longer considered mere replicas of Homeric-Virgilian similes. Their function is not simply to provide small islands of rest in the stream of epic events. Dante's simile plays various parts, epic, lyric, didactic, but has its particular fundamental structure. F. Olivero⁷² has established the fact that the image appears gradually, but once shaped unfolds in various ways. It is either narrowed down to one precise aspect which has to be made clear; or it is enlarged in a vague and lyrical fashion; or comparisons are accumulated to stress an idea. Sometimes images become poetic by multiplication. Sacchetti⁷³ has added nothing new to Olivero's analysis. Whitfield⁷⁴ has noted that in Dante's similes a theoretical statement is illuminated by picturesque examples from nature, life, the poet's own experience, and that the reader comes under the spell of something strange yet almost familiar. For instance, Dante intimates that metamorphoses of snakes into men and of men into snakes could be a normal and quasi-biological process for the punishment of sin. Therefore he asks his reader whether he has ever seen how burning paper gradually browns around the edge. If so, he will have no diffi-

⁷¹ Gianfranco Contini, *Le Rime di Dante* (Turin, 1939), and Curtius, *op. cit.*, p. 247.

⁷² F. Olivero, *The Representation of the Image in Dante* (Turin, 1936).

⁷³ A. Sacchetti, *Il gioco delle immagini in Dante* (Florence, 1947).

⁷⁴ Whitfield, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-86.

culty in understanding how the white limbs of a sinner set afire by the bite of dismal snakes in the other world become brown and take on by this very process the color of the snake before assuming step by step the shape of its body. Thus established in a region of normality beyond strangeness, the reader is fascinated by a Dante truly "trattando l'ombre come cosa salda" (*Purg.*, XXI, 136).

T. S. Eliot⁷⁵ has pointed out, moreover, that this magic realism is further enhanced by everyday notions of the kind exemplified when in the dimness of Hell the shades glance at Dante, the living man, in the way an old tailor peers at his needle's eye in order to thread it—or, as Whitfield has noted, the flames on the soles of the simonists' feet move along only on the outer husk, as happens with greasy objects.⁷⁶ This method of making the unfamiliar homely has been extended by Dante to the purely psychological realm, as Whitfield has shown. Thus the burning love in St. Peter and St. James makes them behave on meeting one another like two billing and cooing doves (*Par.*, XXV, 18-20); and the blessed surging upwards after Mary (*Par.*, XXIII, 121 ff.) have the gesture and the smile of a baby who instinctively turns to its mother's breast, full of gratitude after receiving the nourishing milk. After such re-interpretations of Dante's similes it will be difficult to maintain Santayana's misinterpretation: "No smack of life, but of somnambulism."⁷⁷

A critical re-evaluation of Dante seems the logical consequence of this considerable amount of new analytical work. It came, indeed, with the anti-Crocean assent to the *Commedia* as a whole, not to selected parts.⁷⁸ This assent, certainly, is based on human empathy and poetical catharsis, which are open to any prepared reader. It is identical with an ease and comfort of response,⁷⁹ different from an artificial assimilation. This response is, however, certainly tinged by the general attitude towards Dante's Christian message; it may be a pure aesthetic reaction or a mixed, i.e., a relevant and vital reaction.⁸⁰ The most astonishing fact, however, is that those who believe they respond only aesthetically are caught by this eschatological-mystical tension between sin and the highest spirituality much more strongly than by great tragedy,⁸¹ so that even the aesthetic catharsis reaches here the borderline of grace.⁸² The general belief seems to be that this coincidence between

⁷⁵ T. S. Eliot, *Dante* (London, 1929), p. 24.

⁷⁶ Whitfield, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

⁷⁷ Angelina La Piana, *Dante's American Pilgrimage* (New Haven, 1948), p. 242, quoting Santayana, *Three Philosophical Poets* (Cambridge, Mass., 1927).

⁷⁸ Eliot, *op. cit.*

⁷⁹ William Joseph Rooney, *The Problem of "Poetry and Belief" in Contemporary Criticism* (Washington, 1949), p. 115, note 53.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

⁸² Robert de Luppé, *Délivrance par la littérature* (Paris, 1946).

⁸³ Charles G. Osgood, *Poetry as a Means of Grace* (Princeton, 1941), pp. 25-52.

the aesthetical and the existential catharsis can occur only because Dante's intuition of the Mysterious Reality is offered by an overwhelming (i.e., convincing) symbolism,⁸³ an irresistible symbolism. Irresistible it may truly be called, since all kinds of Dante readers strive to adapt it to their own views rather than to ignore it.⁸⁴

It may be well to repeat that the new trends in Dante scholarship which have here been chosen for emphasis and exemplification concern only major questions of general interest. There remains a phalanx of minutiae, duly listed in the recent bibliographies by N. D. Evola, H. Wieruszowski, Michele Barbi, Umberto Cosmo, Angelina La Piana, and Aldo Vallone.⁸⁵

Catholic University

⁸³ L. Sturzo, "Modern Aesthetics and the Poetry of the Divina Commedia," *Thought*, XVII (1942), 412-432.

⁸⁴ Georges Méautis, *Dante. L'Antépurgatoire. Essai d'une explication* (Geneva, 1944).

⁸⁵ N. D. Evola, *Bibliografia Dantesca 1920-1930* (Geneva, 1932); H. Wieruszowski, "Bibliografia Dantesca 1931-1937," *Giornale Dantesco*, XXXIX (1938); Michele Barbi, "Un cinquantennio di studi danteschi," *Un Cinquantennio di studi sulla letteratura italiana* (Florence, 1937), I, 111-135; Umberto Cosmo, *Guida a Dante* (Turin, 1947), translated as *A Handbook of Dante Studies* by David Moore (Oxford, 1950); Angelina La Piana, *Dante's American Pilgrimage* (New Haven, 1948); Aldo Vallone, *Gli studi danteschi dal 1940 al 1949* (Florence, 1950).

CERVANTES IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIA

YAKOV MALKIEL

To my Mother on her seventy-fifth birthday

IN SCANNING a bibliography of Cervantes studies, one discovers under the head of foreign influence a fairly balanced proportion of monographs and articles devoted to the writer's entire *œuvre* and of those restricted to *Don Quixote*. To the distress of Cervantes' devotees, even works of such accomplished artistry, picturesqueness of setting, and broad appeal as the *Exemplary Novels* have not, except for brief intermittent spells, reached any sizable audience in more than three long centuries.

In no case would the restriction of a comparative study to the work which public response has almost unanimously acclaimed as Cervantes' outstanding masterpiece be more advisable than in an investigation of the reaction of Russian readers to distant Spain's best-known novelist. In planning such a study, one could, conceivably, have focused attention on the hero of the novel alone; however much critics insist on Cervantes' equal accomplishment in portraying the knight and the squire, it is pre-eminently the figure of Don Quixote that has impressed itself on foreign readers. The more removed in space and time readers are from the reality of the Spanish seventeenth-century countryside which Sancho's personage was devised to evoke, the more his racy figure is overshadowed by that of his master—of greater human warmth, more loosely tied up with its environment, hence readily understandable by those who are unprepared to appreciate the subtle local color of the literature of the Spanish Golden Age.

To few groups do these limitations apply more properly than to Russian intellectuals of the nineteenth century (in particular, of its second half), who were relatively little concerned with literary techniques and artistic structure, yet keenly sensitive to new ideas and, specifically, interested in the vexing problem of the individual's place in changing patterns of society. To these readers Cervantes as the towering personality torn between mutually exclusive careers and conflicting artistic loyalties hardly existed; nor did the full content of his multilevel novel, as presented to us by Paul Hazard, occupy the focus of interest nearly so much as its "philosophic" implications.

What mattered primarily and was regarded as Cervantes' flash of genius was the amalgamation into a single type, forcefully delineated and picturesquely named (if *Quixote* amused the author's compatriots, foreigners derived satisfaction from *Don*, suggestive of a quaint charm of nobility), of features of thinking and habits which leading exponents of Russian criticism and belles-lettres believed, with morbid persistence, that they recognized in contemporary society. Cervantes' chief claim to Russian gratitude rested upon this masterly telescoping, upon his skill in finding a label for an increasingly important, disquieting human type previously unidentified—the day-dreamer surrounded by an unromantic world.

The earliest instances of this "typological" assimilation of the *Quixote* romance are traceable to Catherine the Great's correspondence, to the preromantic historian Karamzin, and to Vyazemsky, an influential if little remembered participant in the romantic movement. Gogol in his *Dead Souls* refers to the word "Don Quixotism" (in Russian disguise), bringing out, through the derivational schema, the progressive condensation of a personage of flesh and blood into an abstract notion. Quite recently Aldanov, a skillful *restaurateur* of obsolete speech, has credited the use of the corresponding verb (*donkishotstvovat'*) to Bakunin. Did it matter that the Spanish knight, at least in his initial cast, represented the mediaeval fashion of judging and acting—doomed to clash with what, around the year 1600, were the realities of "modern life"—whereas Russian idealists (whether or not rightly classed as his counterparts) were depicted as pioneers, too far advanced in their thinking and, numerically, too isolated to fit smoothly into their environment or to cope with it with any chance of success? Significantly, amid the militant intelligentsia this grossly simplified Don Quixote shared the fate of transformation "*dal nome proprio al nome comune*" (Migliorini) with the only other type of Spaniard that has enjoyed major popularity in Russia—Don Juan. Stepping stones in this development were the novel, *The Don Quixote of the Nineteenth Century*, by K. P. Masalsky, to whom we owe the first direct but incomplete translation of the novel (1838), and the fragmentary scenes by the well-known idealist, Prince Odoyevsky, *Segeliel, the Don Quixote of the Nineteenth Century*—free variations upon a Cervantian theme. Both works, by their titles alone, call to mind Turgenev's memorable attempt to recreate the plot and characters of *King Lear* within the setting of rural Russia.

The most recent attempt to survey the vogue and influence of Cervantes in Russia is Ludmilla Buketoff Turkevich's *Cervantes in Russia* (Princeton, 1950), which supersedes an earlier essay by C. Derzhavin. The present article is an extended review of Mrs. Turkevich's study.

The volume, which is the outgrowth of a Princeton dissertation begun at Columbia, has two chief merits: the author has devoted years to the ungrateful task of hunting down scattered references to Cervantes, besides translations and adaptations of his works, against the background of Russian interest in Spanish culture (doing full justice to music, dance, and painting); and, mindful of the saying, valid as ever, *Rossica non leguntur*, she has, perhaps with an excessive generosity, translated her excerpts into English in order to bring them within the reach of a wider circle of Cervantes scholars. The book, with its bibliography, indexes, and a dual system of quoting titles in the original (conservatively transliterated) and in English, is designed to render notable service as a collection of organized data.¹

The material is incomplete, as the author concedes, through the inaccessibility of a wealth of sources to a resident of this country, including Shepelevich's two-volume study of Cervantes and the separate monograph on Fernández de Avellaneda, second in importance among Russian Hispanica only to Petrov's book on Lope's comedy of manners; the absence of some stray data may also be noted—such as are bound to slip through the meshes of comprehensive surveys.² The motley quotations could well have formed a kind of highly readable "album," like Gershenson's informative booklet, *Griboyedov's Moscow*. Yet this work requires an additional interpretative effort, and in this respect the author has not risen to the occasion. Her techniques of literary analysis are outmoded and deficient; in drawing parallels and tracing influences, she frequently goes astray, sinning by commission more than by omission, indeed shirking no *tour de force* to drive home the far-reaching importance of a subject which, in reality,

¹ The editing of the book is, unfortunately, below the usual standard of a university press publication. Aside from the intrinsic idiosyncrasies of the transliteration of Cyrillic script, there are regrettable inconsistencies; e.g., *z* appears as *zh*, occasionally as *j* (p. 85), once as *gh* (p. 62). Accent marks are lacking or are gratuitously added in French and Spanish words; some passages are severely mutilated (p. 39, note 21; p. 70; p. 100, note 6; pp. 138-139, 141, 144, *passim*). Foreign names are frequently misspelled, or else improper titles are used, or Christian names are confused with patronymics: read Buturlin (p. 7); N. Findeisen (p. 16); Camacho (p. 17—but Gamache and Kitry, better still Quiterie, in reference to Petipa's ballet, p. 71); Polevogo (p. 21); Prince Vyazemski (p. 34); *Tsar Saltan* (p. 36); Pavel Ivanovich Chichikov (p. 50); year 1928 (p. 77, note 16); Don Alonso Quijano (p. 90); S. S. Uvarov (p. 153); John Cournos (p. 179). The orthography of some foreign names has been amateurishly reconstructed from Cyrillic script; read Boieldieu, not Boaldie (p. 11); George Borrow (p. 60); Comte de Chambord (p. 119). Correct English forms are *The Lusiad*, Visigoths, Slavophile (pp. 37, 62, 73, 79). "Squire" is ambiguous in reference to Selifan and Petrushka (p. 52).

² Professor G. Struve, to whose courtesy I owe some of the remarks in the preceding footnote, recalls the Symbolist poet Sologub's cycle of poems about Don Quixote and his autobiography, in which he reminisces about Cervantine readings; he also points out the influence of the Spanish novel on *The Artist Is Unknown*, by the Soviet writer Kaverin.

is only moderately significant. As a theme, "Cervantes in Russia" (as is equally true of "Tolstoy in the Spanish World") yields sufficient material for a full-length essay, hardly for an extended dissertation.

The following picture, in rough outline, unfolds itself as one advances in the book. There were, originally, but casual and disconnected contacts between the two countries. As their political, commercial, and cultural relations became more lively after 1800, a steadily swelling number of Russian fiction writers, critics, scholars, musicians, actors, stage managers, choreographers, and travelers, besides a host of plain readers, became engrossed in the distant land. Among Spain's literary celebrities, hazily made out at the outset, Cervantes' figure became in time the most firmly delineated and most engaging. Russian taste has changed profoundly at several momentous junctures, and preferences for given facets of Cervantes' art and "philosophy" (traditionally dear to Russian critics) have shifted a good deal since Belinsky. But the esteem for his work among the intellectual élite and its impact on writers able to set new standards and on a broadening group of ambitious readers (witness the demand for steadily improved translations, abridgements, and commentaries), to say nothing of its appeal to children, have constantly increased. Mrs. Turkevich's book is pervaded by this optimistic crescendo music; she admits the tarnishing of the figures of the protagonists through universal use and allegoric interpretation, but dismisses the phenomenon, in cavalier fashion, as "of minor scholarly interest." The reader is left with the impression that, barring unforeseen events, the popularity of Cervantes with his Russian audience, including distinguished creative writers, will continue to mount. Moreover, Mrs. Turkevich is at pains to show that enthusiasm for and understanding of Cervantes have been blended with deepening knowledge of Spain among intellectually curious Russians. These claims are vindicated by liberal excerpts from magazines and newspapers, letters of writers and their friends, records in diaries of diplomats and globe-trotters, theatrical and operatic chronicles, sales figures of publishing houses, catalogues of public libraries and of discriminating bookstores, curricula and bulletins of universities, and announcements of studios.

Without questioning the legitimacy of this essentially quantitative analysis or detracting from the usefulness of the material laboriously assembled, one may raise two fundamental questions: Would it not have been more truthful (and more original) to have portrayed Cervantes in Russia as the author of a single work widely familiar to a multileveled public—as are *Robinson Crusoe* and *Gulliver's Travels*, which, with the possible addition of Grimms' and Anderson's tales, form the stock of a well-educated Russian child's library of foreign books—against the background of prevalent and never substantially

remedied *ignorance*, rather than *knowledge*, of Spain? And should we not soberly admit, at the risk of discarding the cherished image of mounting Cervantian influence, that only for a few decades did Russia's choicest artistic minds truly stand a chance, through inherent affinity, of intuitively grasping the secret formula of Cervantes' art—an intimacy of contact never again reached at such an altitude of accomplishment, in spite of the growing circulation of steadily refined annotated translations and the expanding body of scholarly and essayistic studies?

Fundamentally, for Russians more than for other Europeans (including the Catholic Poles), Spain has remained the country of the unknown, *par excellence*; the motivation of Tchaikovsky's *Don Juan*, Cui's *Bolero* and *Maisonnettes espagnoles*, and Borodin's *Serenata alla spagnola* has something of the exotic touch of Puccini's *Madama Butterfly*. Spain's unswerving orientation toward the Roman Church, whose chief advocate she has been for centuries, matched by Russia's championing of the Greek Orthodox tradition—the almost simultaneous expansion of one country westward across the Atlantic Ocean, the other eastward beyond the Asiatic frontier—the absence of common commercial interests, of direct military conflicts, of naval rivalry (as with England and Holland), and of dynastic entanglements—these facts have long delayed the establishment of a modicum of contact between the two nations. Occasional embassies were sent from the secluded Grand Duchy of Muscovy to Spain as early as 1524 and again under Tsar Alexis in 1668 and 1680, and from Spain, for the first time, to the court of the ephemeral Peter II in 1727. But Spain, the declining colonial power of the West, did not figure prominently, except for one fleeting moment, in the plans of that bold schemer, Peter the Great. It took the cosmopolitan Catherine II, German-born, imbued with French culture, and steeped in Enlightenment, to foster tentative translations (from the French) of great works of Spanish literature into Russian and to spark Russian interest in trade relations with Spain. By 1805, Russians unacquainted with foreign tongues were in a position to read in their native language three works of Cervantes, *La Galatea*, *Don Quixote*, and the *Exemplary Novels*, in indirect, wholly inadequate translations (in whose concoction the young Zhukovsky, of later fame as a master of *Nachdichtung*, was implicated). A point not touched upon by Mrs. Turkevich is whether a common growing hostility and, later, resistance to Napoleonic aggression provided the initial bond of friendship and of heightened mutual curiosity between the two widely separated nations. Precisely in 1809 the *Quixote* story was brought for good to the Russian ballet theater, after repeated failures, and in 1811 the first Russian grammar of Spanish was produced. Glinka finally visited Spain in the years 1845-47.

Nevertheless Spain, even to Russian cosmopolitans, remained an incomparably more distant land than France and Italy (a Russian princess became a famed French queen in the eleventh century, Frankish steel was praised in the *Song of Igor's Host*, and Italian architects transformed Moscow long before 1500), and even more distant than "exotic" Turkey and Persia, in many respects akin to Russia, as the Eurasianist school of historiography tends to show. Spanish proper names have been distorted by Russians in a bizarre fashion; there is evidence that, despite the efforts of devoted scholars, Spain has until quite lately been regarded by educated, unbiased Russians as a peculiarly confusing country, queer beyond imagination, as Norway was in the Cervantian world, witness *Persiles y Sigismunda*.³ The average Russian intellectual trained around 1900 was well versed in the niceties of French and German, occasionally also of English; some women had a remarkable knowledge of Italian culture, which they acquired frequently as an adjunct to the study of the fine arts. Yet the idea which Russians (except select literature students and the *avant-garde* crowding Yevreinov's and Meierhold's studios) entertained of Spain's past and present was, to speak mildly, inarticulate. A cultured layman of that time may be credited with bits of knowledge about

³ The founder of structural linguistics, Prince N. Trubetzkoy, analyzed the pronunciation of Russian by a Czech, and vice versa. It would, on cultural grounds, be worth while to extend this inquiry to toponymy: the greater the distortion of proper names, the greater the distance between two nations, not only in geographical terms. Russian, in patterning *Aragoniya* and *Portugaliya* on *Kastiliya*, goes farther than French, German, English, and Italian. The ending -o, to untutored speakers of Russian, is eminently characteristic of Spanish (the candid Italian is most impressed by the margin of diphthongization and by final -s): witness monstrosities like *Costa Rico* (under the pressure of *Porto Rico*), *Los Angeles*. *Negritos* and Arg. *pampas* have been mistaken for singulars and provided with additional plural endings (the former is also misstressed). *Málaga* and *Jérez*, known through the wine trade, are accented like *Granada*, *Córdoba* like *Sevilla* (cf. Fr. *Cordoue*). The initial consonant of *Juan*, as a rule, is rendered correctly; but *Algeciras* is pronounced in French, *Gibraltar* in German fashion, and *Gijón* does not fare well at all. Those curious to know what happens to *Huelva*, *Huesca* on a Russian map, may consult Brockhaus-Efron's *Encyclopaedia*, XIII, 400, which, in its article on Old Spanish literature, speaks of *Enrico de Vilena* and *Manrico*, in harmony with the o-complex. Names of German mountain chains of transparent derivation (*Erzgebirge*, *Riesengebirge*) are literally translated into Russian; *Sierra de Gata*, *de Gredos* are taken over as unanalyzable units. Blok's Mozartian *Donna Anna*, sweet to Russian ears, is objectively no more satisfactory than Fr. *tsarine* (which reflects Germ. *Zarin* rather than Russ. *tsaritsa*) or Littré's incredible *tsarowits* (Russ. *tsarevič*); cf. R. Wellek's remarks, *Comp. Lit.*, II (1950), 183. Contemporary writers (Aldanov, Tefli) testify to the outlandish (occasionally comic) impression that sonorous Spanish names make on the Russian's ear; I can corroborate their statements through introspection. In Aldanov's latest novel, *Istoki*, I, 14, Mamontov, in reading a morning paper of the year 1874, understands all foreign news except that relating to Spain and Central America; he laughs heartily at the word *junta*, just as Argentines are vastly amused by the unpronounceable names of Slavic immigrants.

Hispano-Arabic civilization: the expulsion and dispersal of Sephardim (whom he would more readily seek in Amsterdam than in Odesa), the voyages of Columbus and the subsequent conquests in the New World, the severity of inquisitorial procedure (if familiar with Dostoevsky and with Schiller's *Don Carlos*), the broad outline of the Don Juan motif (thanks to Mozart and Pushkin), the colorful Andalusian gypsydom (which Russian *tsigans* and the opera *Carmen* helped to visualize). Velázquez and, even more, Murillo (the collection of his paintings in St. Petersburg's Hermitage Museum was much admired by Valera), Loyola, Lope, and, through the prestige of German scholarship, Calderón, may have had a familiar ring to his ears. But can we expect him to have had even a faint idea of Juan Ruiz, Jorge Manrique, and Góngora, of mediaeval balladry, rogue novels, mystic writings, and *conceptismo*, of Basque customs and legends, of the contrasting patterns of the Asturian and the Valencian landscape, of the cultural dilemma of the Catalans, or of indigenous Mexican civilization—to cite only a few points dear to Western lovers of Spain?

Thus it would have been permissible to portray the Spanish scene of *Don Quixote* (with the ballet theater's Kitry replacing authentic Quiteria!), as fancied by generations of Russian readers and spectators, in the guise of a *féerie* not unlike the *Arabian Nights*, which derive most of their fascination from the Westerner's total unfamiliarity with Harun-al-Rashid's Baghdad. The Russian reader endowed with acumen, but unconcerned with the historical and geographic background of Don Quixote's itinerary, was bound to detach Cervantes' hero from his environment, to transmute him into a "type" (witness Belinsky's review of Sollogub's *Tarantas* and the commonplace juxtaposition of Don Quixote and Hamlet), and not infrequently to stretch certain features of this image in accord with his personal whims and preferences.

In her Introduction, Mrs. Turkevich fittingly stresses the receptivity of the passive partners, as a factor not to be lost sight of by students of influences. Can one not with equal justification speak of the receptivity of periods, or of generations and constellations of writers? The period roughly from 1820 to 1845 may indeed be called, as regards the "foreign relations" of Russian literature, the climax of a mood of hospitality, curiosity, and adaptability. At no time (with the possible exception of the period of the Symbolist movement, which produced cultured talents, yet no genius) were quite so many checkered sources tapped, in a triple sense: the range of foreign languages read by *literati* (not, as subsequently, by philologists) was spectacular, including Polish, Serbian, Italian, and Spanish; the chronological limits of the periods exerting influence were singularly broad, comprising Biblical and Classical antiquity, the late Middle Ages, the Renais-

sance, Classicism, "Baroque," Enlightenment, and Romanticism; the number of peacefully coexisting genres, levels of style, and metrical forms was peculiarly high. (In all these respects the period of Turgenev and Goncharov was to bring severe restrictions). The Pushkin-Gogol era, which witnessed feverish production of a protean richness of form, is characterized by fluidity of patterns, versatility of minds, and emphasis on "invention" not unworthy of Cervantes; there was a near absence of fixed models accepted by a tacit consensus of opinion as obviously ("typically") Russian; imaginative experimenting with novelties received as much encouragement as skillful introduction and adaptation of miscellaneous foreign prototypes, old and new. Russia, eager for thorough cultural regeneration (as Spain was between the composition of *La Celestina* and Garcilaso's eclogues), was permeated by a keen desire to absorb, with discrimination, all that the choicest minds of Europe (and, through inclusion of Washington Irving, even America) could offer her. Within this unique configuration of a culture still receptive and already creative, the legacy of Spain and, in particular, of Cervantes stood better chances of striking the fancy of distinguished writers than at any earlier or later moment. To what extent did these potentialities materialize?

Artistically and intellectually, Mrs. Turkevich rightly asserts, Pushkin shared many of Cervantes' predilections; she notes their common interest in the "inborn genius of the people" and their critical attitude toward contemporary society on which both brought to bear the sharp-edged tool of satire—Cervantes, in some of his *Exemplary Novels*, e.g., in the central section of the *Licenciado Vidriera*, and in a few plays more forcefully than in *Don Quixote*; Pushkin, in the long-misinterpreted sketch, *The Village Goryukhino*. Pushkin was unanimously regarded by his contemporaries as the most clever Russian of his generation; for a while Cervantes' intelligence was less evident to hurried readers, but Américo Castro's book has restored the balance.

Mrs. Turkevich might have gone further in drawing the parallel, since spontaneous congeniality is as worthy a subject of comparative studies as the formally recognized topics of influences and dependences. Common features include boundless curiosity and extensive though unsystematic and hasty reading; recurrent interest in literary doctrine; preoccupation with the poet's place in society and his responsibilities; zestful search for new artistic forms, ceaseless experimenting with free blends and combinations of known elements of composition; long wavering (with entirely different results) between the media of prose and verse; delight in picturesque, concrete detail, in the *mot juste*, matched by the ability not only to present pen pictures, but to contrive plots, to be a genuine "inventor"; lightness of touch, even in dealing with serious matters; prevailing serenity of tone; maintenance

of a pleasing balance between extremes, in action, characterization, discourse, and implicit "philosophizing"; a life of feverish activity, though with different outlets and uneven distribution of the climactic points. In other respects their creeds and temperaments clashed. A cautious comparison could be drawn (with a side glance at Lermontov) between the roles Algiers and the Ottoman Empire, on the one hand, and the Crimea and the Caucasus, on the other hand, played in their lives and writings.

Of greater importance is the relationship between some more recondite artistic formulas of the two writers. Successive generations of scholars and ingenuous readers alike have alternately extolled Cervantes and Pushkin as paragons of romanticism or as pioneers of realism. In fact, it is easy (less difficult than in the case of Flaubert, where one can speak, at best, of submerged romanticism) to name writings of both authors which typify the two dissimilar approaches. Yet in the narratives that many moderns would easily select as those most boldly planned and most elaborately composed (*Don Quixote*, *El Licenciado Vidriera*, *Coloquio de los perros*; *The Bronze Horseman*, *The Queen of Spades*) Cervantes and Pushkin have, with masterly skill and imaginative élan, interwoven fanciful and realistic threads. Schevill was, presumably, the last Cervantes scholar willing to emphasize his author's deftness as attentive onlooker and careful painter of genre pictures; in 1919, he even proposed to rename the *Exemplary Novels*, at least in translations into English, *Pictures and Manners of the Spanish People*, apparently confusing Cervantes' professed designs with a use to which some of his works can be put by readers preeminently interested in the *realia* of the novelist's milieu. Cervantes himself, with unmistakable obstinacy, took pride in his talent as inventor, not as observer. Works which we, with him, regard as masterpieces and others for which he cherished a not easily understandable affection contain a considerable admixture of happenings contrary to expectation, as when two dogs are endowed with the power of speech, or events are interpreted by a protagonist (*Don Quixote*, the *Licenciado of Glass*) in an unpredictably queer fashion—so that Cervantes' alleged realism, even in his most mature writings, must be taken with a grain of salt. The difference between the masterpieces and the so-called romantic tales of love and adventure (usually leading to recognition scenes, in Byzantine and Italianate style) lies not so much in the presence or absence of features which are "improbable" against the background of Cervantes' surroundings as in the deliberate use to which the author has put them, besides the obvious primary purpose of entertaining the reader. In the outstanding works unusual situations or sequences of events are redeemed by the incomparable opportunities they afford to paint human characters in action with profound truth

and such a degree of intensity and suspense as rigorous realism, content with the representation of uneventful day-to-day life, could never have achieved. Improbability of plot is compensated for by doubly truthful and memorable portrayal of characters, under sharply changing angles. Where this redeeming feature of exquisite artistry is lacking, in Byzantine stories, Italian *novelle*, Timoneda's *patrañas*, and some of Cervantes' intercalations in novels, starting with *La Galatea*, the modern reader remains unsatisfied. The same is true of Pushkin's intermingling of fact and fancy; leaving aside his juvenile *Ruslan and Ludmila*, written in Ariosto's vein, one may argue that he introduced magic and visionary elements (*The Bronze Horseman*, *The Queen of Spades*) to cast human foibles into sharper relief and, concurrently, to keep the reader's suspense at a high pitch. Also common to both writers is the astonishingly modern interest in the twilight zone between sanity and madness.

Spain loomed prominently in Pushkin's world. When he casually dubbed it "half-African," he may have betrayed one personal reason for this powerful spell—the importance he attached to his Ethiopian descent (from "Peter the Great's Moor"). As a versatile polyglot and an accomplished cosmopolitan in the realm of letters, he is likely to have acquired a respectable working knowledge of written Spanish; and as an insatiable lover, he was interested to spend several years of his short life span, with major interruptions, on the compact Don Juan drama.

But these multifarious manifestations of affinity and attraction do not entitle us to speak bluntly of Cervantes' direct influence on Pushkin; least of all in the case of *Eugene Onegin*. Yet Mrs. Turkevich, taking up an ill-advised offhand remark of Pisarev, tries to establish solid dependence, on the flimsy ground that the reading of certain books (romances of chivalry, sentimental novels) precipitates the course of events in both *Don Quixote* and *Eugene Onegin*. It is inexplicable how Pisarev could have left unrevised the infelicitous passage containing the parallel; and one is baffled to see this impressionistic statement amplified and expatiated upon in a monograph which may embody the research of a decade. The structure of the two books, the levels of tone, the main characters (individually and in relation to each other), the techniques of narration, description, dialogue, and digression, in short, all conceivable criteria belie the suggested comparison and assumed genetic kinship—the confrontation of the aging knight, lean and dry, with blossoming, lovesick Tatiana can only be called grotesque.

Cervantes' influence on Pushkin, as distinct from the broad margin of mutual affinity, is thus reduced to a single motif in *La Gitanilla* and in *The Gypsies* (Aleko, like Andrés, joins the gypsy band out of love for a girl) and possibly to a lone poem, "The Poor Knight," which is

not rated among the poet's most polished and is chiefly remembered for its usefulness to Dostoevsky in writing *The Idiot*. In no instance has Cervantes been identified as the sole or principal source of Pushkin's inspiration. One can, at best, speak of concomitant influence, of stray, diffuse resemblances not remotely comparable in impact and sharpness of focus to the poet's debt to Chateaubriand or Lord Byron.

We happen to possess documentary evidence that Pushkin, in suggesting to Gogol the idea and outline of *Dead Souls*, drew his attention to *Don Quixote* as a commendable model. While Gogol's visit to Spain in 1837 and his command of Spanish belong to the realm of legend (no one spun such yarns as diligently as he himself), there is proof that in 1847 he avidly read Botkin's report on contemporary Spain (the exploratory trip had been made in 1840). The circle of his Petersburg friends, who gathered in the salon of Mme Smirnova, was surely the most Hispanophile *cénacle* that Russian literature can boast; besides Pushkin as the central figure, it included the senior poet Zhukovsky, Glinka, and Sobolevsky, to whom we owe the second authentic translation of *Don Quixote* (later outclassed by Mme Watson's, and the recent one by Krzhevsky and Smirnov). Gogol refers expressly to Don Quixote in one of the most labored passages (to judge from the number of corrections in extant drafts) of the second part of *Dead Souls*.

On the surface, the personalities of Cervantes and Gogol represent two poles: the Spaniard virile, sturdy as a youth and resistant in his old age (even in the face of A. Fernández de Avellaneda's insidious scheme), courageous, frank, and self-controlled as only the strong can be, a born leader of men who showed his mettle as a captive in Algiers; the Ukrainian physically a weakling, indifferent to women except in deceitful letters to his mother, haunted by anguishes and a persecution mania (in reality, blessed with benevolent, patient friends), histrionic and given to lying, with alternate fits of exaggerated self-assurance and pusillanimity, utterly incapable of inspiring confidence. Cervantes' maladjustments in later years, it is conjectured, were due to a concatenation of adverse circumstances; Gogol's, invariably, to weaknesses inherent in his nature. In spite of these irreconcilable temperaments there are odd resemblances between important facets of their artistry; and a similar fate awaited their most celebrated books. Critics have long noted the inability of both to describe powerful love scenes. Yet both excelled in painting the society of men and crowds in which the two sexes mixed; with equal skill both conjured up the atmosphere of old inns and winding highways—what has humorously been called "viatic lore" (Cervantes deftly described mounts, witness the scraggy nag Rocinante and the Dapple, while Gogol's *rêveries* about carriages are unsurpassed); both delighted in picturing cities; yet the Span-

iard's sketches of Seville, Toledo, Valladolid, and Barcelona are lacking in the haunting, morbid quality discernible in the Russian's *Arabesques*.

The resemblance goes further. The two masters, at their most original, created novels of multiple meaning, leaving to subsequent generations the obnoxious or welcome task of interpreting their "hidden purposes." The result of this masking, which challenged the critics' imagination, may appear disastrous in the long run, but the interest in the works has at least been sustained for generations. Gogol was long regarded as a humorist, which he was (though not exclusively) and believed himself to be, at least in his moments of serenity. Cervantes' humor may not be the keynote to his *Quixote* for the initiated, but surely it has been that, from the start, for the unsophisticated reader. Radicals hastened to proclaim Gogol as a social satirist, although he had little desire to pass as such; indirectly, they foisted upon him the role of a preacher, which he later, through hindsight, pretended to have been from the outset. Cervantes too was not spared this misinterpretation; some readers claimed that the portraits of the duke and the duchess, and their *entourage*, had been drawn with a view to ridiculing or upbraiding a decadent, inactive nobility.

For a century almost, Gogol was praised in schools as a realist of the highest order, as a minute portrayer at first of his native Ukraine (interweaving genre pictures with folklore) and later of all Russia—a belief against which V. Nabokov-Sirin has recently inveighed in a shrewd, if a bit whimsical and unnecessarily vituperative booklet. This, it will be recalled, was the opinion which a scholar of Schevill's rank held of Cervantes. Nabokov, a child of the early twentieth century, arbitrarily separates, with the fastidiousness of a literary gourmet, the "true" (mature?) from the "false" (not yet fully developed?) Gogol, and tries hard, through internal reconstruction, to piece together his prose-poet's inner cosmos, full of fantastic oddities created by a capricious, fanciful, hypersensitive artist's unrealistic visions. Long before Nabokov's controversial book, M. Gorlin blazed the trail for this interpretation in his thesis on Gogol and Hoffmann. Many Spanish-speaking *vanguardistas* of this century's successive vintages would cheerfully subscribe to an interpretation of Cervantes as a magician of words (*Wortkünstler*, to quote Hatzfeld) and a conjuror of images—although a slight diversion was produced, a generation ago, through the discovery by Toffanin and Castro of Cervantes the thinker (Gogol, a true son of his mother, was more of a superstitious believer, especially a believer in Hell).

Humorist, social critic, realist, aesthetically refined dreamer, philosopher—each of these five designations has been applied, at one time or another, to the authors of *Don Quixote* and *Dead Souls*. What has

the late twentieth century in store for these writers, after the decline of the currently fashionable artistic and structural approaches, if the interest in their masterpieces does not ebb? Without venturing guesses, let us repeat that the chameleonlike change of impressions conveyed by *Don Quixote* and *Dead Souls* (with the possible addition of *The Government Inspector* and a few short stories, notably *The Overcoat*) on readers differently conditioned or of diverse minds and tastes, whether foreseen by the authors or unintentional, forms a solid bond of common destiny between the two writers.

What is the actual indebtedness of Gogol to Cervantes, as distinguished from mere affinity (which might lead one to fancy that elements of the plot of *El Licenciado Vidriera* could have been invented by Gogol, toiling on his *Arabesques*, or that an occasional brush stroke worthy of Cervantes' *Novelas* may be detected in Gogol's *Portrait*)? Aside from these coincidences, Gogol's debt can best be gauged by concentrating on motifs and techniques, rather than on characters and ideas, dear to *fin de siècle* critics. Mrs. Turkevich sounds convincing when she traces the conversation and correspondence of the two dogs in Gogol's *Notes of a Madman* to the *Coloquio de los perros*; but her attempt to identify Chichikov as an "accurately inverted" Don Quixote is quite abortive and represents, with the portrayal of Tatiana Larina as a disguised knight errant, the most vulnerable spot in the book. With few exceptions, writers of fiction lack the mathematical frame of mind presupposed by such calculated inversions. To make things more intricate, the inversion is said to be only partial; there exist also coincidences in direct ratio, as when Chichikov shares the knight's perseverance. The same method of straight and reverse equation is later clumsily applied to Rudin. Mme Smirnova, a witness to the conversation between Pushkin and Gogol leading to the conception of the nucleus of *Dead Souls*, sized up the true state of affairs with greater precision: "Pushkin spent four hours with Gogol and gave him a theme for a novel, which like *Don Quixote* is to be divided into episodes. The hero is to travel through the provinces. Here Gogol will make use of his own travel experiences."

In addition to the similarity in basic structure, including the planned purification of Chichikov, on the pattern of Don Quixote's reincarnation in Alonso Quixano el Bueno (as suspected by Veselovsky), the assessment of Gogol's debt to Cervantes requires the critical study of their techniques, which has successfully been essayed by Zhirmunsky in his monograph on Pushkin and Byron and by other followers of the recently suppressed Formalist school. In his unconventional book, Nabokov, as a fellow *littérateur*, gives away some of Gogol's trade secrets, e.g., his ability to hint at background characters, invisible on the stage, through fleeting mention by vocal personages, and through insinuating

comparisons and parenthetical remarks in narrative and descriptive prose. Cervantes, the master of dense interludes, preferred in the Italian manner to intercalate whole episodes, circumstantially or with anecdotal brevity, which were extraneous to the central plot (to the dismay of some readers, even among his contemporaries). There are also similarities in characteristic interruptions of narration, the syncopes and hiatuses of action—in *Don Quixote*, giving way to exchanges of opinion between knight and squire, broadening out occasionally into lengthy harangues. Corresponding to these interruptions, in *Dead Souls*, are the lyrical digressions, including the evocation of Russia as Chichikov, at the close of the first part, leaves the provincial town N. A problem apart is the toying of both authors with connotative proper names, a game at which Gogol has been recognized as a past master, to the distress of readers of translations doomed to miss the rich overtones of Korobochka, Khlestakov, Nostrov, and other evocative and even weird names, vaguely associated with familiar words, like Manilov. Cervantes derived greater satisfaction from the pitiful blundering of Sancho in his attempts to pronounce stilted polysyllabic words; note the transformation of Alonso Quixano into Don Quixote, suggestive of a piece of mediaeval panoply.⁴

The eighty pages on the age of realism form the most heavily documented section of Mrs. Turkevich's book and contain, conveniently assembled, a wealth of noteworthy data difficult of access. But these pages also serve to show that the painstaking ferreting out of details from dusty monographs and journals may occasionally distort the explorer's perspective. Mrs. Turkevich's own data tend to contradict her claim of Cervantes' growing influence in Russia between 1850 and 1880, unless in her computations the response of mediocrities counts as much as the reaction of men of genius. Speaking of writers journeying through Spain and reporting on their impressions, she comes up with Grigorovich's travelogue (superficial in her own estimate), two journalistic notes by the prolific Boborykin, Kustodiev's forgotten studies, largely in church history, and contributions of even lesser writers—truly a miserable record, compared with what was being written by perceptive and alert Russians on England, France, and Germany in those same crucial decades. Botkin's substantial *Letters about*

⁴ Professor Leo Spitzer, "Perspectivism in *Don Quijote*," *Linguistics and Literary History: Essays in Stylistics* (Princeton, 1948), p. 77, amiably credits me with the discovery of the etymology of *quijote*, but prefers to analyze the name *Quijote* as a variation upon *Quijano* suggested by Lanzarote. The anonymous translator of the initial chapters of the novel, whose work appeared at Cöthen in 1621 under the title *Don Kichote de la Mantzscha, das ist: Juncker Harnisch aus Fleckenland* (see Hazard, *Don Quichotte de Cervantès: étude et analyse*, p. 321), certainly grasped the innuendo long before my own note in *Lang.*, XXI (1945), 156. And who would deny to Cervantes the insight that we readily grant to his obscure German imitator?

Spain, which elicited notable response, are inexplicably classed with these travelogues, although they belong chronologically and in other respects to the preceding age of Pushkin and Gogol. Mrs. Turkevich states that original articles, in addition to mere translations, were being written by Russians on Spanish subjects during this period. But the truth is that the record of Russian Hispanists compares unfavorably with the researches of Ticknor, Prescott, Bancroft, and Lea in America, Morel-Fatio in France, and Wolf in Austria; only a negligible proportion of the Russian historical writings dubbed "original" were based on independent inquiry.

A scrupulous examination of the data arrayed under the head of "Allusions" records clearly what *Don Quixote* meant to leaders of Russian thought of the period. Numerous intellectuals (pre-eminently "Westerners") nurtured a peculiar, in part disproportionate, interest in a slightly idealized Europe. *Don Quixote*, the only Spanish book read or known by title, was referred to more or less pertinently to round out the panorama of "European" (as opposed *en bloc* to Russian) literature. Individual, atypical features of Spain, Cervantes, and *Don Quixote* were inevitably obliterated in this gross classification.

Thus, Grigoriev spoke of Shakespeare, Dante, Cervantes, and Molière as artists toiling in "epochs of integral creation,"⁵ and of "... images such as those of Dante's *Inferno*, the laughter of Cervantes and Molière, and the moral infallibility of Shakespeare." Herzen casually contrasted Cervantes' irony with Ariosto's playfulness and Boccaccio's exposé of monkish life. Pisarev contrasted Hamlet with *Don Quixote* (cf. Grigoriev and Turgenev), and likened Cervantes' talent to Shakespeare's, Byron's, and Pushkin's. Goncharov, protesting against the inroads of naturalism, added Cervantes' name to a checkered group—Aristophanes, the Roman dramatists, Dante, and Shakespeare, a list amplified elsewhere to include Homer, Molière, and Goethe—all of whom he cited as realists and classicists alike (*Don Quixote* was classed with Hamlet and King Lear, as more than "mere portraits of some queer individuals"). Buslayev quoted *Don Quixote* along with *Cid romances* and the *Decameron* as "not only samples of different nationalities, but consecutive stages in human development"; in another context he illustrated with Shakespeare, Tasso, and Cervantes the "amazing reworking of national themes into artistic forms" and associated Cervantes with Shakespeare and Molière as persons free "from the exclusiveness of the crude morals of their epochs." Pismensky admired in Cervantes a degree of objectivity found also . . . in Smollett and George Sand. Karelin likened *Don Quixote* to Milton's

⁵ The translations here quoted are Mrs. Turkevich's, with only slight changes to avoid unidiomatic English; no attempt has been made to check them systematically against the originals.

Satan (in whom Lermontov's *Demon*, at that time overestimated, had aroused lively interest); both typified "a total renunciation of sensuality." These sundry opinions are not quoted here for what they may be worth (some are quite naive), but because they show Cervantes' name persistently linked to those of other European writers. This was the extent of his usefulness to most Russian thinkers; he filled a gap in the intellectual map of progressive Europe which those cosmopolitans held up to their reactionary or apathetic compatriots. Only a few writers, toward the end of the century, made serious efforts to grasp Cervantes' own world, among them Avseyenko in his study of Cervantes as the founder of the modern novel (1877) and two scholars of professional standard, Storozhenko and Veselovsky.

Other Cervantian allusions—Grigoriev's denial of any resemblance between Don Quixote and Griboyedov's *raisonneur* Chatsky; Herzen's identification of Don Quixote with romanticism and of Cervantes with realism (and the derogatory designation of the would-be revolutionaries of 1848 as Don Quixotes); the precocious Dobroliubov's casual reference to the knight (which prompts Mrs. Turkevich's apposite remark, "The critic does not seem to have understood Cervantes' character at all"); Pisarev's polemic recourse to the title "A Russian Don Quixote" in his study of the Slavophile Kireyevsky—tend to confirm our observation that Don Quixote, with increasing frequency, was used as an effective label, especially in political controversy (cf. the fate of Lovelace in Russia). Should this abstract reference to the bare name be spoken of, with monotonous insistence, as a token of Cervantian influence?

This dreary picture is supplemented by Karelin's translation of the novel (1866) into idiomatic Russian, but through the prism of an intermediary French version, preceded by an irresponsible biographical sketch, and by the playwright Ostrovsky's "Russification" of the *Interludes*, for which he later felt apologetic (readers of S. G. Morley's conscientious version of that work will be shocked to hear that it took the translator one week, on the average, to finish off one play). As for the general use of Spanish themes in literature, particularly in poetry (then no longer in the foreground), Mrs. Turkevich is at a loss to produce any more distinguished names than Ilyin, Polonsky, and Maikov, of "anthology fame." The only clear-cut example of genuine artistic inspiration left to mention is Anton Rubinstein's *Danse espagnole*, *Toreador*, and *Don Quichotte*; yet the composer's background seems atypical of Russian society.

There remain the two seemingly exceptional cases of Turgenev and Dostoevsky. Turgenev's purported dependence on Cervantes affords a laboratory test for inferences made by some practitioners of comparative literature. There is incontrovertible proof of his intense interest

in things Spanish and particularly in Cervantes for almost twenty consecutive years. We know, largely from his own admissions, how his friendship with Pauline Viardot-García and his acquaintance with her mother induced him, at the age of twenty-nine, to take Spanish lessons for several months (1847); how he temporarily acquired colloquial fluency in the language and read a series of Spanish books in the original; how he singled out a scene of *Don Quixote* (the hero's departure from the ducal estate) for specific mention in his first novel (1855); and how, six years later, he delivered his speech, of world-wide reverberations, on "Hamlet and Don Quixote." Finally, we find Turgenev in 1866 working on a translation of a tale as difficult of rendition as *Rinconete y Cortadillo*, much as Pushkin had once labored on *La Gitanilla*—Russian connoisseurs knew how to appreciate the *Exemplary Novels*. With so many facts solidly established, in part through the efforts of I. S. Rosenkranz, it is tempting to muse on possible (as some style it, "inevitable") influences of *Don Quixote* on Turgenev's fiction.

Mrs. Turkevich does not avoid the pitfall; she is quick to characterize both Rudin and Bazarov, disparate as they seem, as Don Quixote's belated Russian progeny. The case she makes out is not convincing. Turgenev's concern with Spanish was more casual than his intimate, slowly maturing familiarity with German and French culture (which his background predestined him to develop), since it was due to a chance acquaintance, made outside Spain; it remained a pleasant adjunct to but not a prime condition or outgrowth of his enduring friendship with Mme Viardot. Initially, his rambling readings in Spanish (Calderón side by side with Martínez de la Rosa) were a kind of hobby; true, out of this haphazard, semijocular occupation with a colorful culture there evolved an abiding interest in Cervantes. May the conclusion be drawn that intellectual curiosity, even if increased by fascination through temperamental contrast (compare the "inventor" Cervantes with Turgenev, utterly unimaginative), necessarily led to dependence in creative work?

Disregarding approved stylistic and structural analysis,⁶ Mrs. Turkevich, in the mid-twentieth century, uses exclusively the delineation of characters plus loose shreds of the plot as a basis of comparison. The complete dissimilarity, in *Don Quixote* and Turgenev's early novels, of plan and professed purpose, inventive power, range of background material, architectonic devices, interweaving of motifs,

⁶ Mrs. Turkevich not only implicitly dismisses the methods and findings of Russian Formalists, but acts counter to the precepts of those American Hispanists who regard vocabulary, syntax, and versification as the safest guides in establishing the authorship and approximate date of anonymous writings, especially comedias. Inquiries into authorship and into literary influences are, in point of method, obviously contiguous fields of endeavor.

characterization of personages, handling of dialogue, techniques of description, narration, and suggestion, is not taken into account or is dwarfed out of proportion. Even if we limit ourselves to the skeletal outline of characters, how can the cowardly, undecided Rudin, with his occasional flutters of miscalculated activity, be traced to the ever-energetic, overoptimistic, undauntedly courageous knight? Their personalities or roles may have a few loosely connected points in common, e.g., the ineffectual struggle with a hostile or rather complacent milieu. Yet why reject Alceste's paternity (via Griboyedov), or fail to recall as distant prototypes the Byronic heroes, eminently successful in Russia?

One report has it that Turgenev was surprised to see his first-born Rudin and the later creation, Bazarov, referred to as "the same kind," and modern readers share his amazement, in spite of the verdict of late nineteenth-century critics. It takes a good deal of juggling with words to convince us that Bazarov, a reckless cynic, is the direct offspring of Don Quixote; they have only their uncompromising nature in common. The claim is the more baffling since Mrs. Turkevich realizes that Bazarov's portrait was patterned on a long-identified living individual. Combining her genealogical reconstructions, one would have to treat Bazarov and Larina as twins; by throwing in Rudin, we get the most singular set of triplets ever produced in comparative literature.⁷ To draw this extreme conclusion is to skirt the absurd. The danger could have been averted by resorting sparingly to unsupported conjectures. Thus, the influence exerted by books on the intellectuals and the enlightened youth of Russia is a fact observable in life, and so is the clash of many sensitive individuals with their callous fellow men; one need not assume the spread of Cervantian ideas in Russia to explain these facts.

Dostoevsky, who had such a small share of Cervantes' equipoise and serenity, but whose ten years in Siberia, in their effect on his personality and work, vaguely call to mind Cervantes' shorter period of captivity in Africa, poses some thorny problems for the historian of Spanish-Russian relations. As W. Giusti remarked twenty years ago, the Russian novelist created "quixotic" characters (Makar Devushkin, Golyadkin), presumably long before his firsthand acquaintance with Cervantes. When his interest in the Spaniard's works was at length awakened, possibly through the *furor* created by Turgenev's celebrated essay, he avidly read *Don Quixote* and responded to it in a highly personal, passionate way. How hasty or subjective

⁷ One is surprised to see that Griboyedov's Sophy, whose conduct is understandable in the light of her sentimental and frivolous readings (as Prince S. Mirsky has rightly stressed), has not been included in Don Quixote's Russian retinue.

the reading was is seen in an amusing confusion (unnoticed by Mrs. Turkevich) of Bachelor Sansón Carrasco with the barber in a lengthy entry of *The Author's Diary*. A certain amount of influence on a receptive writer attuned to respond to whimsically assimilated readings is not unlikely in view of this enthusiastic comment on the adventures of the knight errant; but the range of Dostoevsky's experiences and meditations was hardly enriched as a result of an absorbing interest in *Don Quixote*, despite his own encomiastic statement to the contrary. The influence may be defined as the adoption of oddly assorted features of the Spanish novel which, after reflection by the distorting mirror of Russian social critics (indifferent to aesthetic insights), buttressed with exotic illustrations some earlier ideas of Dostoevsky. There is no true affinity; nor did Dostoevsky, who learned a good deal from Balzac and Dickens, owe a heavy debt to Cervantes' literary workmanship.

An issue apart is raised by the much-discussed "sources" of Prince Myshkin in *The Idiot*. Through express reference to Don Quixote (anent a conversation between the personages of the novel about Pushkin's ballad, "Poor Knight") Dostoevsky made it easy for critics to detect Cervantian overtones in his book. As early as 1902 Merezhkovsky elaborated on the implied kinship of the two protagonists; Hazard did not withhold his approval in 1931; Bem, in his exhaustive study in 1936, held a brief for the hypothesis (which he complicated by introducing Chatsky into the equation); and Mrs. Turkevich has allotted generous space to the problem (reduced to its original proportions through the elimination of Chatsky) and its successive ramifications. Dostoevsky, at the height of his career (when suffering from frail memory), was able to fuse a variety of traits distilled through reading, personal observation, hearsay, and imaginative thinking into an organic whole; it is well nigh impossible (indeed, pedantic) to try to determine the share of each strain even with approximate accuracy. The situation is aggravated by the existence of eight widely discrepant drafts of the novel, showing the transformation of the hero from a sensual into a chaste character. There is no proof that the writer reread *Don Quixote* with engrossing interest during the crucial interval between the sharply divergent seventh and eighth versions. Slowly evaporating recollections of readings in Cervantes, among a host of other thoughts pressing on his mind, were probably operative in suggesting a few extra touches for Prince Myshkin's laboriously repainted portrait.

Much of what has been said here with a view to qualifying rather than extending Mrs. Turkevich's statements applies, *mutatis mutandis*, also to the influence of Cervantes in the twentieth century, concerning which information is too fragmentary to encourage sweeping general-

izations. Cervantes' intermittent influence on Russia has at no time been overly great. One is free to argue that, had Pushkin lived longer and, as Lednicki muses, further specialized in the direction of prose, Cervantian influence on the mainstream of Russian literature might have been incomparably more powerful. For it was in Mme Smirnova's exclusive salon, in the heated discussions of Pushkin, Gogol, Glinka, and their friends, that the full stature of Cervantes' genius, not a thin abstraction adjusted to current needs and fashions, was most keenly grasped by a group of Russians still malleable and free from prejudging their impressions, yet sufficiently strong to mold new patterns of thought and art.

University of California, Berkeley

THE INEZ DE CASTRO THEME IN EUROPEAN LITERATURE

MARTIN NOZICK

THERE ARE certain characters in literature which exercise a perennial and self-renewing fascination on the creative mind. They are always raw material for the crucible of the imagination, and therefore, although born in different countries, belong to world literature. Among these Inez de Castro is to be counted, although her moving story—in spite of its manifold treatments¹—has not received its full due. The inherent dramatic interest of the story, its romantic, idealistic qualities, and the pity, admiration, and horror it arouses call for epic treatment.

The story of Inez, Coelho de Garza,² as she was called, first appeared in Portuguese history in the *Crónica de El-Rei Dom Pedro I*³ of Fernão Lopes (ca. 1380-ca. 1460). However, what is left of Lopes' work concerns itself only with events after Inez' death. It is a pity that we do not have from his own hand the account of the beginning of the *grande desvayro*—the meeting of the lovers Inez and Pedro, the development of their liaison, and the difficulties they encountered. This part was appropriated by Rui de Pina, whom Herculano calls a "crow in peacock's feathers,"⁴ and reworked in an inferior manner. However, Lopes does give us a full account of how, years after Inez' death, Pedro, now king, claimed that he had married her secretly, although those who had supposedly witnessed the ceremony could not agree on the date. Many, including the historian, doubted the authenticity of these

¹ J. de Araújo, *Ignes de Castro, notas de bibliographia, acompanhadas do poemeto de d. Adolfo de Castro, Camões moribundo y la sombra de Ignés de Castro* (Florence, 1891); William Bork, "La balada inglesa, la leyenda de Doña Inés de Castro, y varios motivos en el Romancero General," *Anuario de la Sociedad Folklórica de México*, IV (1943), 313-349; Mario Méndez Bejarano, "Lágrimas poéticas," *Estudios eruditos in memoriam de Adolfo Bonilla y San Martín* (Madrid, 1930), pp. 601-613; H. Theodor Heinemann, *Ignés de Castro. Die dramatische Behandlung der Sage in den romanischen Literaturen* (Leipzig, 1914).

² B. E. C. Dugdale, "Ines de Castro and Pedro of Portugal," *Quarterly Review*, CCXXIV (1915), 356-378. This is the best succinct account in English of the entire affair.

³ *Crónica de El-Rei D. Pedro I, por Fernão Lopes* (Lisbon, 1895), chaps. XXVII, XXVIII, XXX, XLIV.

⁴ A. F. G. Bell, *Portuguese Literature* (Oxford, 1922), p. 87.

testimonials. Lopes condemns the unethical way in which Pedro exchanged some Spanish refugees, who had sought shelter in Portugal, for Pero Coelho and Alvaro Gonçalves, two of Inez' assassins—whom Pedro the Cruel of Castille surrendered after they had fled to his kingdom for protection. The third assassin, Diego Lopes Pacheco, was helped by a beggar he had befriended to escape to Aragon and France. Pedro had his victims brought before him while he was eating, had them tortured and their hearts torn from their bodies. The chronicler notes:

Muito perdeu el-rei de sua boa fama em tal escambo como este, o qual foi havido em Portugal e em Castelha, por mui grande mal, dizendo todos os bons que o ouviam, que os reis erravam muito indo contra suas verdades, pois que estes cavalleiros estavam, sobre segurança, acoutados em seus reinos.⁵

Pedro López de Ayala (1332-1407), in his *Crónica de Don Pedro de Castilla, Año Onceno, mil trescientos sesenta, capítulo catorce*,⁶ had also given a short account of this affair. He tells us how Pedro had married Constanza, daughter of Don Juan Manuel, how he had taken Inez as his mistress, and had had three children by her, and how she had been killed on her estate at Sancta Clara de Coimbra. This writer, too, flatly condemned the breach of faith of which Pedro was guilty in surrendering the Castilian for the Portuguese refugees.

The purely literary works in Portugal of which Inez is heroine are numerous. We may start with the ballad,

Dos ricos paços de Coimbra
Nobre Infante se partia
Com seus pagens e creados
Para real montería,

deploring Pedro's ill-timed departure on a hunting expedition, unwittingly leaving the unprotected Inez at the mercies of her murderers.⁷ We of course also call to mind Garcia de Resende's *Trovas á morte de D. Ines de Castro*,⁸ probably the most beautiful verses ever written to describe Inez' pathetic pleas for her life, and the presentation of her children to the king in an effort to mollify him. Garcia popularized the idea that the king was truly moved by Inez' supplications, but was berated for his irresoluteness and weaknesses by his counselors. That the king was loathe to be responsible for the crime—a theme fully exploited by later writers—is adduced by his answer:

⁵ Fernão Lopes, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

⁶ *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, LXVI (Madrid, 1919), 506.

⁷ Theophilo Braga, *Romanceiro Geral Portuguez* (Libson, 1906-07), II, 340-341.

⁸ *Oxford Book of Portuguese Verse*, ed. A. F. G. Bell (Oxford, 1925), pp. 81-87, taken from the *Cancioneiro Geral* (1516).

Se o vos quereis fazer
 Fazei-o sem m'o dizer,
 Qu' eu nisso nam mando nada
 Nem vejo a essa coitada
 Porque deva de morrer.

Of Antonio Ferreira's tragedy, *Castro*,⁹ written in 1557, Ferdinand Denis wrote: "Nous aimons à rappeler ici que la première pièce régulière donnée en Europe après la Sophonisbe a été l'*Inès de Castro*."¹⁰ To this we should add that it was the first dramatization of the story. Stiffened by the mold of the Greek tragedy, it is nevertheless distinctive on several scores. The king, in a deadlock of the emotions of father and ruler, reaches truly grandiose heights; although repelled by the cruelty of the contemplated act, he is impelled to condone it for the welfare of his kingdom. Inez herself becomes a living, throbbing being in the fourth act when she pleads desperately and hysterically for her life. She grovels before the king, kissing his hands, imploring that mercy be shown to a defenseless woman, a woman in love, a mother.¹¹

Socorre-me, perdoa-me, não posso
 Falar mais. Não me mates, não me mates.

The finest part of the play is, of course, the famous lyric which the chorus sings:

Quando amor naceu
 naceu no mundo vida,
 claros raios ao sol, luz ás estrelas;
 o ceu resplandaceu
 e de sua luz vencida
 a escuridão mostrou as cousas belas.¹²

Of Camões' lines on Inez in the third canto of the *Lusiadas*¹³ we can add nothing to what Voltaire said: "C'est, à mon gré, le plus grand morceau du Camões; il y a peu d'endroits dans Virgile plus attendrissants et mieux écrits."¹⁴

Gil Vicente refers once to the famous heroine, in his *Comedia sobre a divisa da cidade de Coimbra*:

As mulheres de Castro são de pouca fala,
 Fermosas e firmes, como saberês
 Polla triste morte de Dona Ines,
 A qual de constante morreo nesta sala.¹⁵

⁹ *Poemas Lusitanos do Doutor Antonio Ferreira, segunda impressão* (Lisbon, 1771), Vol. II.

¹⁰ *Nouvelle biographie générale* (Paris, 1858), XXV, 850.

¹¹ *Poemas Lusitanos*, p. 165.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 135.

¹³ *Os Lusiadas*, ed J. D. M. Ford (Cambridge, Mass., 1935).

¹⁴ "Essai sur la poésie épique," *Œuvres complètes de Voltaire* (Paris, 1877), VIII, 334.

¹⁵ *Obras de Gil Vicente* (Coimbra, 1907), II, 86.

Maria de Lara e Menezes (1610-1649) wrote a poem called *Saudades de D. Inez de Castro*,¹⁶ under the pseudonym of Manoel de Azevedo, but this work was not published until the beginning of the eighteenth century. In the first canto, Inez has a presentiment of her death and begs Pedro not to leave her. The reason for his departure is not given; at one point he makes a vague but sinister allusion to "esta ausencia cruel forçosa, urgente . . ."¹⁷ The unhappy woman leaves her house for the solitude of the fields and stops at the Fonte dos Amores to continue her lamentations; it is in this bucolic setting that she is killed. The second canto consists of Pedro's apostrophes of grief—nothing in this world can assuage his pain, and yet death will not come for

... não posso morrer, porque não vivo.¹⁸

From this point there is a gradual diminuendo—he becomes more meditative and philosophical, blaming love for bringing sorrow in its wake. Although there is no mention of the honors paid Inez after death, the poem ends as the author admonishes those who fear the total oblivion of death to remember her who

... depois de ser morta, foi Rainha.¹⁹

We should also note Domingos dos Reis Quita's (1728-1770) play, *Inés de Castro*,²⁰ which was translated into English by Benjamin Thompson in 1800; Nicolau Luis' *Dona Inez de Castro* (1772), translated into English by John Adamson in 1808;²¹ the lovely lines of Bocage (1765-1805) on *A Lamentavel Catastrofe de D. Inés de Castro*;²² and Joao Baptista Gomez' *Nova Castro*²³ of 1803. Antonio Feliciano Castilho's (1800-1875) *A Fonte dos Amores*²⁴ is a sad bucolic elegy, not so much to Inez as to the garden that saw her death.²⁵ Even Almeida Garrett (1799-1854), perhaps Portugal's greatest romantic poet, began a play on the theme which never got beyond the embryonic stages.²⁶

¹⁶ *Saudades de D. Inez de Castro, poema em dous cantos. Por M. de A., segunda edição* (Lisbon, 1824).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

²⁰ *A Castro; com prólogo e revisão de Mendes dos Remedios* (Coimbra, 1917).

²¹ *D. Inez de Castro, a Tragedy from the Portuguese of Nicola Luiz, with remarks on the history of that unfortunate lady, by John Adamson* (Newcastle-London, 1808).

²² *Oxford Book of Portuguese Verse*, p. 230.

²³ *Nova Castro* (Rio de Janeiro, 1850).

²⁴ *Oxford Book of Portuguese Verse*, pp. 239-240.

²⁵ Concerning this famous spot, see Carolina M. de Vasconcellos, "Pedro, Inés, e a Fonte dos Amores," *Lusitania, Revista de Estudos Portugueses*, II (Lisbon, 1925), 159-182.

²⁶ H. Theodor Heinemann, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

Antonio Feliciano's son, Julio de Castilho, wrote a long play, *D. Ignez de Castro* (1875),²⁷ followed by Maximiliano de Azevedo's *Ignez de Castro* (1894)²⁸ and Henrique Lopes de Mendonça's *A Morta* (1891).²⁹ However, to my mind, the most novel of the longer treatments is Eugenio de Castro's poem, *Constança* (1900),³⁰ in which the author tries to do for Pedro's wife what Matthew Arnold did for Iseult of Brittany. His attention is not focused on Inez' fate but on the deep sorrow of the gentle, self-sacrificing Constança, deeply in love with her husband, yet extremely compassionate of the anomalous position of her dear friend Inez. She is mortally ill, and the fear that Inez and Pedro may feel that they are the cause of her death torments her. She bribes a page to elope with her so she may leave behind her the blackened name of an adulterous wife—all to mitigate the lover's sense of shame. The next morning, about to expire, she receives her husband's last kiss, only to implant that very kiss on Inez' lips in a supreme gesture of self-renunciation.

Before we leave Portugal, we cannot fail to mention the colorful, organic, historical reconstruction—after the method of Michelet—which Antero de Figueiredo made of the story.³¹

In Spain, the story of Inez is the subject of some of the finest ballads. Two³² were written by Gabriel Laso de la Vega (1587). They tell how Don Pedro fell in love with a *doncella de Galicia*, bastard daughter of Pedro Hernández de Castro, first cousin to the prince. When Don Pedro's wife died, Inez yielded and she and Pedro were married in secret at Berganza. The angered king is persuaded by *tres malos vasallos* that Inez must die, for the marriage would mean total ruin of the kingdom. After the murder, Pedro declares war on his father, who soon dies of grief. Pedro is crowned, and has Inez' remains disinterred and carried in solemn procession from Coimbra to Alcobaza, where all must pay homage to the dead woman and kiss her hand as cold as snow. An anonymous ballad describes the entire awesome ceremony.³³ In yet another³⁴—also anonymous—it is related that Pedro met Inez only after the death of his wife and while the king was

²⁷ *D. Ignez de Castro*; drama em cinco actos e em verso (Rio de Janeiro, 1875).

²⁸ *Ignez de Castro*, drama em cinco actos (Lisbon, 1908).

²⁹ *A Morta* (Lisbon, 1891).

³⁰ *Constança* (Coimbra, 1900).

³¹ *Dom Pedro e D. Inez, O Grande Desvayro, 1320-1367* (Lisbon, 193?). A short, fanciful account of the story may be found in Artur Augusto, *Romance de Inês de Castro, crônica episódica* (Lisbon, n.d.). In Cesar da Silva's *Inês de Castro, crônica episódica* (Lisbon, n.d.), the author illustrates each episode of Inez' drama by quoting the literary treatment given it by authors from Rezende down.

³² Agustín Durán, *Romancero General*, BAE, XVI (Madrid, 1921), 217-218, Nos. 1236, 1237.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 218, No. 1238.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 317-318, No. 1301.

negotiating another marriage for his son with Doña Blanca of Navarra. When Pedro confesses to Blanca his love for Inez and his secret marriage to her, the princess is offended and the king of Navarra declares war on Portugal. When the king of Portugal agrees to the murder of Inez, his counselors descend upon her and cut her throat. The transition between this cruel act, the transfer of the victim's body, and Pedro's revenge is whimsically abrupt.

In 1557 Fray Jerónimo Bermúdez, under the pseudonym of Antonio de Silva, wrote his *Tragedia de Nise Lastimosa*,³⁵ following very closely the *Castro* of Ferreira. He never leaves his Portuguese model very far behind, even to the choruses, the perplexities and doubts of the king, Inez' premonitory dreams, her pleas, the appearance of the children. This play was followed by a sequel, *Nise Laureada*,³⁶ which is the first dramatization of the legend of Inez' posthumous honors and coronation. It depicts Pedro as a bloodthirsty tyrant, now obsessed by the idea of revenge, the criminal who violated the sanctuary of the Castilians in his kingdom to carry out his half-mad purpose. Oddly enough, the most dignified and admirable of all the characters in this play are the repatriated prisoners, Alvaro González and Pero Coelho, who are unrepentant and firmly convinced that the welfare of their country warranted their crime. Their fortitude and unwincing courage make them the heroes of the drama rather than Pedro, who appears as a Senecan monster, deriving no gratification from his fearful deeds and calling on death in the realization that he has overstepped the limits of his power, that he has been guilty of *hubris*.

We know very little about the Licenciado Mejía de la Cerda except that in 1611 he wrote a play in three acts called *Tragedia Famosa de Inés de Castro, Reyna de Portugal*³⁷ which was included in the *Tercera Parte de las Comedias de Lope de Vega y Otros Autores*. Very often he uses the exact words of the *Nise Lastimosa*; but he introduces a new character, Don Rodrigo, who is in love with Inés and is rebuffed by her; it is he who is mainly responsible for the crime. When the king shows his aversion to the idea of murder, it is Rodrigo who drives the ruler to take a cowardly stand. The king says:

Lavo las manos,
De su sangre, cortesanos
Vosotros la derramad,
Testigos de mi piedad
Son los cielos soberanos.³⁸

³⁵ *Orígenes del teatro español*, ed. L. F. de Moratín, *Piezas anteriores a Lope de Vega* (Paris, 1838).

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ *Dramáticos contemporáneos a Lope de Vega*, ed. Ramón Mesonero Romanos, *BAE*, XLIII (Madrid, 1924), 391-409.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 404.

A *Doña Ynés de Castro*—unfortunately lost to us—is on the list of Lope de Vega's plays found in the 1618 edition of his *Peregrino en su patria*.³⁹ In his play, *Don Lope de Cardeno*,⁴⁰ Lope inserted a fragment of a ballad referring to the moment when Pedro returned to find his beloved and his two children dead.

In Vélez de Guevara's *Reynar después de morir*⁴¹ there are again only two children (Inez had had three, two sons and a daughter); the *gracioso* Brito plays an important role for comic relief (one of the two or three light touches in all Inez literature); and it is Pedro's betrothed, Blanca, who overcomes the king's mercifulness by revealing to him the secret marriage of Inés and Pedro. However, she balks at the idea of murder:

Viva mil siglos Inés
Que si hoy por ella padezca
No es culpada en mis desdichas.⁴²

The king is not free from remorse over the death of Inés; he dies soon thereafter. When told of his father's death, Pedro evinces no real grief and almost immediately expresses the joyful thought that now he will be able to bestow upon his beloved her rightful position, a mood which changes to delirium when a sorrowful Blanca tells him of Inés' murder. There is no lapse of time between this scene, the capture of the assassins, and the new king's orders for the procession and coronation of Inés.

The anonymous ballad (No. 1238) referred to above is interpolated with slight abridgments and changes into Juan de Matos Frago's (1608-1692) drama, *Ver y creer*.⁴³ This play purports to be the second part of Vélez de Guevara's *Reynar después de morir*, but actually has very little to do with the Inez story, even though the central character is the unhappy Pedro, now king of Portugal. He plays the role of a sort of *deus ex machina* for others and is responsible for bringing a Calderonian situation of honor to a happy conclusion.

We must now jump to 1799, to Luciano Comellas, who wrote a one-act *Doña Inés de Castro*, *escena trágico-lírica*,⁴⁴ restricted in cast to

³⁹ J. Griswold Morley, *Lope de Vega's Peregrino Lists*, Univ. of California Publications in Modern Philology, XIV, No. 5 (Berkeley, 1930).

⁴⁰ *Obras de Lope de Vega, publicadas por la Real Academia Española, Obras Dramáticas* (Madrid, 1917), pp. 654-692. This ballad is in Act III, p. 685.

⁴¹ *Tesoro del teatro español*, ed. Eugenio de Ochoa (Paris, 1838), IV, 220-247.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 238.

⁴³ *Dramáticos posteriores a Lope de Vega*, ed. Ramón Mesonero Romanos, BAE, XLVII (Madrid, 1924), 283-301. The ballad, p. 287, is sung to King Pedro to dissipate his sadness after he has done the honors to the dead Inés and killed her murderers.

⁴⁴ Luciano Francisco Comellas, *Doña Inés de Castro* (Barcelona, 1799).

Inés and Pedro alone and provided with a background of suitable music changing to fit the mood of the discourse. In the next century there appeared a heavy, almost unreadable *novela histórica caballeresca*⁴⁵ of almost two thousand pages by Manuel Amor Meilán, who enlarged on the facts, added innumerable characters, and in general distorted the story nearly beyond recognition. The early part of our century saw a lyrical zarzuela adaptation of the Guevara drama.⁴⁶

When we turn to France, we find that the most noteworthy homage paid to the Inez theme was in Houdart de la Motte's tragedy,⁴⁷ presented with great success in 1723. The dramatist takes great liberties with the story; he invents the character of the queen, Pedro's step-mother and mother of the king of Castille and of Constance, who is now only the betrothed of Pedro and not his wife. The queen is depicted as a fiercely devoted mother and an implacable enemy, who ultimately poisons Inés, the woman who stands in the way of her daughter's happiness. The character of Constance, an innocent victim in this web of circumstance and emotion, appealed to Houdart as she was later to appeal to Eugenio de Castro, and is delineated as a gentle and magnanimous soul. In what is otherwise a very conventional and pseudoclassical play, the author introduces some unorthodox elements. He has the temerity to bring Inés' children onto the stage; he appropriates an entire line from Corneille's *Cid*, "vous parlez en soldat, je dois agir en roi";⁴⁸ and he very often descends to bathos.⁴⁹ The play aroused a storm of criticism and polemic, and was ridiculed in many parodies.⁵⁰ The best of these travesties, produced by Legrand and Dominique in the same year and called *Agnès de Chaillot*,⁵¹ was the model for Don Ramón de la Cruz when he wrote his *sainete*, *Inesilla la de Pinto*,⁵² in 1770. In 1826 Bretón de los Herreros translated Houdart's drama into Spanish.⁵³ About a century after Houdart's work, Madame de Genlis invented a story of her own based primarily on the

⁴⁵ Manuel Amor Meilán, *Reinar después de morir* (Barcelona, 187?).

⁴⁶ Juan José Cadenas, *Inés de Castro o Reinar después de morir*, música de los maestros Calleja y Lleó (Madrid, 1907).

⁴⁷ *Inés de Castro* (Amsterdam, 1723).

⁴⁸ Arsène Houssaye, *Men & Women of the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1886), Part II, p. 85.

⁴⁹ The day after the première Voltaire said: "J'allai hier à *Inés*; la pièce me fit rire, mais le cinquième acte me fit pleurer. Je crois qu'elle sera toujours au nombre de ces pièces médiocres et mal écrites qui subsistent par l'intérêt."

⁵⁰ V. B. Grannis, *Dramatic Parody in the 18th Century* (New York, 1931).

⁵¹ *Fin du répertoire du Théâtre Français* (Paris, 1826), V, 93-126.

⁵² *Sainetes de Don Ramón de la Cruz*, ed. Cotarela y Mori, *NBAE* (Madrid, 1928), pp. 105-111. Also see my article, "A Source of Don Ramón de la Cruz," *MLN*, LXIII (1948), 244-248.

⁵³ *Autores dramáticos contemporáneos y joyas del teatro español del siglo XIX* (Madrid, 1882), pp. 149-150.

Comte de Forbin's (1777-1841) painting of "Inès de Castro, couronnée après sa mort."⁵⁴

Victor Hugo wrote an *Inès de Castro*⁵⁵ at the age of fifteen. The profusion of disguises, purple patches, extraneous characters, secondary plots, and lugubrious settings of this childish endeavor point to the vivid, extravagant imagination of the later genius. When Inès is chained in the court scene, Pedro breaks the chains with his own hands. When the king yields and announces his approval of his son's secret marriage, Inès is poisoned by the vindictive queen, a clear indication of Houdart's influence. The last scene is characteristically laid in a *caveau sépulcral*. It is there that the dead woman is crowned; far-away music is heard and Inès' ghost appears radiant and surrounded by angels. It may be said that Hugo served his early apprenticeship for *Hernani* with his Inès.

In 1912 Alfred Poizat wrote, in rather stiff alexandrines, a three-act tragedy called *Inès de Castro*,⁵⁶ manifestly influenced by Vélez de Guevara even to the characters of Brito and the Infanta and the king's sudden death followed immediately by the capture of the assassins and Inès' coronation. We should also mention the tragedy of *Inès de Castro*⁵⁷ written in French by the Brazilian Alberto Caraco in 1941. At the end of this play, Pedro's anguish has turned him into a raving maniac. Vengeance on Inès' murderers will not be enough; he wants innocent victims and will find his outlet only in violence and war "vengeant la fin d'Inès sans assouvir ma rage."⁵⁸

Much more deserving of analysis is the *Reine morte*⁵⁹ of Henri de Montherlant, presented on December 8, 1942 on the stage of the Théâtre Français, with the actress Madeleine Renaud in the title role. Perhaps the most fascinating character of this play is Bianca, Pedro's betrothed, an adolescent girl of seventeen, chimerically eloquent, tormented by a fierce sense of pride in her station and possessed of a curious, inverted generosity. She improves on all the previous Blancas (or Blancas) in that she not only bears no real ill will towards Inès, but is willing to take her to Navarre to save her from destruction. The king, Ferrante, is sixty years old, weary of ruling, morbidly introspective, an aged Hamlet, hating himself for his indecision, curiously mixed in his

⁵⁴ *Inès de Castro; Mort de Pline l'Ancien*, in *Œuvres de Mme de Genlis* (Paris, 1827), Vol. XXX.

⁵⁵ *Œuvres complètes de Victor Hugo*, Vol. XLV, *Victor Hugo raconté par un témoin de sa vie, Œuvres de première jeunesse* (Paris, n.d.), I, pp. 311-364.

⁵⁶ *Inès de Castro*, tragédie en 3 actes, représentée pour la première fois au Théâtre François Coppée, le 26 mars 1912, in *Monde Illustré*, July 27, 1912.

⁵⁷ *Inès de Castro; Les martyrs de Cordoue* (Rio de Janeiro, 1941).

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

⁵⁹ *La Reine morte, ou Comment on tue les femmes, drame en trois actes, suivis de Régner après la mort, drame de Luis Vélez de Guevara* (Paris, 1942).

sentiments toward his son, whom he calls *médiocre et grossier*. One feels that the father-son antagonism has preceded the crisis over Inès, and that the decision to kill Inès is the father's last opportunity to pull his son up to the austere heights of royal position. Perhaps better than anyone else, Montherlant instinctively understood the true character of Pedro's father, the son of the saintly Isabel and the poetic Diniz, a man harboring a mystical conception of his position as king. One feels that the ruler's unnatural attitude towards his son is the manifestation of a deep, almost cosmic disquietude; that an impulsive move from Pedro would have broken down that wall of tension and fear of sentiment which separate them so tragically. The king is tired of hypocrisy, of the court, of the conventional trappings of romantic love. Oddly enough, he feels that to Inès he can open his heart and pour out his doubts, confess his weaknesses, the monumental disenchantment of a world-weary ruler. She, in return, confesses to him that she is carrying Pedro's child, their first. The king is appalled by the contrast between his weariness and the beautiful hope of Inès, between his macerated idealism and the radiance of the expectant mother. He will have her murdered to prove to himself that his will is stronger than his humanity. He orders her killed with one blow—she is not to suffer—and dies shortly thereafter, predicting the horrible punishment which his counselors will suffer at Pedro's hands. Inès' body is brought in and the entire court groups itself about her. Even the young page joins them and—supreme irony—the king, even in death, is alone! Tacitly he is condemned even as history would condemn him.

Inez' literary fortunes in England have not been prosperous. Mrs. Aphra Behn wrote a sentimental novel, *Agnes de Castro*,⁶⁰ in 1688, based on a work by a Mlle de Brillac called *Agnès de Castro, nouvelle portugaise*, published the same year. The English "lady novelist" distorts parts of the story beyond recognition. Of Pedro, the irascible, brusque, cruel prince, she makes a seventeenth-century gentleman; she introduces the figure of Elvira Gonzales, sister of Alvaro Gonzales, one of Agnes' assassins, and makes of this woman Pedro's former mistress discarded at the time of his marriage to Constantia. Constantia is angelicized; it is only through her that Agnes learns of Pedro's love, and the women sigh and mingle their tears. The princess languishes; Agnes languishes; the honorable prince, not daring to declare himself, languishes; there is general languishing, brought to a head only by the jealous Elvira's machinations. Her brother, the saturnine Alvaro, is also in love with Agnes, and is jealous of Pedro's position, power, and beauty. Consequently, he is easily incited by his sister to

⁶⁰ *Works*, ed. Montague Summers (London, 1915), V, 211-256. The introduction to this novel provides a brief bibliography of English works treating the Portuguese heroine.

carry the story to the king, who orders Alvaro to marry Agnes immediately. But Agnes is protected by her staunch friend, Constantia, who apparently is more concerned over Agnes' happiness than over her husband's fidelity. Elvira forges a note which falls into Constantia's hands; this princess makes no complaint but falls into a deep melancholy which kills her. She dies, extracting from Pedro a promise to give Agnes her place on the throne. Agnes' chaste resistance to Pedro yields only when he falls sick; it is only to save his life that she consents to a secret marriage. But one night, while she is asleep, she is murdered and Pedro goes mad, plunging the country into war and seeking revenge.

In 1696 there was produced an *Agnes de Castro*⁶¹ in five acts and blank verse. Since the author, sixteen-year-old Catherine Trotter (later Mrs. Cockburn), was little more than a child, the production created quite a stir.⁶² The play is an immature treatment, deriving from the novel of Mrs. Behn and that of Mlle de Brillac, and of little intrinsic value. *Elvira*,⁶³ a play by David Mallet published in 1763, was also based on Mrs. Behn's novel; it was acted thirteen times with David Garrick as Pedro and Mrs. Cibber as Elvira.

More noteworthy is the slow, solemn beat of Felicia Hemans' verses on the *Coronation of Ines de Castro*,⁶⁴ written less than half a century later. Mrs. Hemans was steeped in Spanish and Portuguese, and we may say that her knowledge of the Inez story came to her firsthand. Her verses, in addition to their historical value, have a certain heavy beauty, perhaps too nineteenth-century for our taste. They treat only of the macabre chapter of Ines' coronation:

... within that rich pavilion
 High on a glittering throne,
 A woman's form sat silently,
 'Midst the glare of light alone.
 Her jewelled robes fell strangely still—
 The drapery on her breast
 Seem'd with no pulse beneath to thrill,
 So stone-like was its rest!

A novel, *A Queen After Death*,⁶⁵ published in the United States, is

⁶¹ *Agnes de Castro*, a tragedy as it is acted in the Theatre Royal by His Majesty's Servants. Written by a young lady. London: Printed for H. Rhodes in Fleet Street, R. Parker at the Royal Exchange, S. Briscoe, at the Corner of Charles Street, in Russel Street, Covent Garden, 1696.

⁶² Edmund Gosse in *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, XXXIV, 87-118.

⁶³ *Elvira: a tragedy*. Acted at the Theatre Royal in Drury-Lane. London, A. Millar, 1763.

⁶⁴ *Poems*, ed. Rufus W. Griswold (New York, 1880), pp. 161-164. Mrs. Hemans' translations of Camões' sonnets were a definite factor in the diffusion of the reputation of the Portuguese poet in England.

⁶⁵ Harman Black, *A Queen After Death* (New York, 1933).

significant principally for a long, if garbled and misspelled, bibliography. The style is riddled with clichés;⁶⁶ the author is much too generous with local color; the commonplace conversations smack more of the 1930s than the 1300s. However, the portrayal of Juan Manuel as a Machiavellian grandee is not unsuccessful. The novelist explains the king's contempt for culture and moral laxity as a reaction against his father Diniz' easy morals, "Bohemianism," and poetic talents. The torture scene is done with minute attention to the gruesome details: Coelho, as befits his name, is first treated as a rabbit prepared for dinner. Vinegar is poured over him and onions rubbed into his face, and for good measure he is subjected to the "water-cure." Gonçalves' ears and lips are plucked off by red-hot pincers, followed by the application of the garrote. For the rest, the writer adds nothing to the interpretation of the facts or the legend that grew up around them.

From this brief survey we can draw some conclusions. First, we may say that directly, or through translation, hearsay, and balladry, the story of Inez and her love and death, compounded of history, the accretions of the popular imagination, and individual interpretation—often quite arbitrary—has left its mark in nearly every country of Western Europe.⁶⁷ Not only Inez but every other major figure of her tragic story has been speculated upon, reshuffled, and remolded; motivations have been enriched or impoverished; characters have been emphasized or disregarded. Its import is universal, for its primary elements are germane and sympathetic to every intellectual climate; like all great stories it suggests—and keeps on suggesting—more than it tells. A drama of violent emotions, deep sentiment, idealism, and savage deeds, it suffers in the hands of the mediocre or derivative writer, especially when cramped into severe classical forms. But neither does the uncontrolled imagination or unleashed pen provide the proper expression. The tale has unfortunately suffered from both extremes of treatment; Inez still awaits her full literary apotheosis.

Queens College

⁶⁶ The author describes the love of Inez and Pedro as a "... tempest of passion and love that swirled in their brains and sent indescribable thrills through their bodies" (pp. 54-55).

⁶⁷ The Inez legend did not fail to penetrate into other countries in Europe. At this point in my investigations, I can only offer the following as a tentative bibliography for Germany and Italy: Ludwig Polster, *Inez de Castro, dramatisches Gemälde in fünf Aufzügen* (Breslau, 1903). Karl Kreisler, *Der Inez de Castro-Stoff im romanischen und germanischen, besonders im deutschen Drama* (Kremsier, 1909). Also see Ludwig Pfandl's review of Kreisler's study in *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie*, XXXV (Dec. 1914), 400-403. Manuel Pereira Peixoto d'Almeida Carvalhães, *Inês de Castro na ópera e na coreographia italianas* (Lisbon, 1908). Giuseppe Persiani, *Inês de Castro, ópera seria em três actos* (Paris, 1839); libretto by Salvatore Cammarano. Luigi Bandozzi, *Inês de Castro, dramma storico in 5 atti, consacrato al centenario dell'India, con prefazione del signor Joaquim de Araujo* (Leghorn, 1898).

DOSTOÏEVSKI ET BALZAC

MARTHE BLINOFF

LE CRITIQUE russe Léonide Grossman, dans son étude sur "La Bibliothèque de Dostoïevski,"¹ tente de classer les écrivains dont l'œuvre a pu influencer le romancier russe. Il distingue trois groupes : les "proches," tels que Schiller et Cervantès, génies apparentés dont la lecture a favorisé l'évolution de Dostoïevski ; un deuxième groupe—Pouchkine, Dickens, Gogol, Lermontov—dont l'exemple l'a amené à se tourner vers l'expression littéraire ; enfin, les auteurs d'un troisième groupe auraient déposé dans le sol fertile de son être créateur la graine que ce terrain allait nourrir. C'est parmi ces derniers, avec Voltaire, Hugo et Hoffmann, que Grossman place Balzac. Quelle que soit la valeur de ces distinctions peut-être discutables, elles situent exactement le rôle attribué par le critique russe à l'inspiration balzacienne dans l'œuvre de Dostoïevski. En effet, si originale, si profondément libre de toute empreinte littéraire que paraisse cette œuvre, si riches les ressources que l'expérience personnelle a procurées à son auteur, il n'en est pas moins vrai—c'est encore Léonide Grossman qui le fait remarquer—que les livres ont joué dans la vie intellectuelle de ce lecteur insatiable un rôle qu'on ne peut méconnaître. Les citations abondantes, les évocations littéraires si fréquentes dans son œuvre en sont le témoignage le plus apparent.

Dans la bibliothèque de Dostoïevski, particulièrement riche en livres français, se trouvaient deux éditions complètes des œuvres de Balzac. Ce fait n'a rien qui puisse étonner, car Dostoïevski adolescent éprouvait déjà pour Balzac un intérêt qui devait durer toute sa vie. Il se manifesta dès l'aube de sa carrière littéraire par la traduction en russe d'*Eugénie Grandet* (en 1844) et, une année avant sa mort, en 1880, se révélait encore par une référence au *Père Goriot* dans le manuscrit du discours prononcé pour l'inauguration du monument de Pouchkine à Moscou.²

¹ Léonide Grossman, "Biblioteka Dostoievskogo," *Seminari po Dostoievskomu* (Moscou, 1923).

² Il s'agit du dialogue célèbre entre Rastignac et Bianchon sur le mandarin. Ces pages sont évidemment citées de mémoire, comme l'indiquent certaines inexactitudes de détail. Seules d'ailleurs sont évoquées la question de Rastignac : "Si tu pouvais t'enrichir en tuant d'un signe de tête, sans bouger de Paris, un

On sait quelle influence encore considérable la littérature française exerçait en Russie dans ces années 40 qui virent les débuts de Dostoïevski, de quelle diffusion rapide et vaste elle jouissait et quels commentaires passionnés elle suscitait. Si Balzac, malgré trois séjours en Russie, semble n'avoir fait aucun effort pour connaître les livres russes, en revanche le public russe connaissait les siens aussi bien que ses lecteurs français. *La Revue étrangère de littérature, des sciences et des arts*, éditée en français à Pétersbourg, publiait ses romans en même temps qu'ils paraissaient en France. Des traductions russes en étaient imprimées dès les années 30. En 1835 une version abrégée du *Père Goriot* parut dans *La Bibliothèque de Lecture*, revue où furent publiés également des articles de critique sur Balzac. La famille Dostoïevski était abonnée à cette revue. Et dès 1838, alors qu'il est encore à l'école, le jeune Dostoïevski a déjà lu presque toutes les œuvres parues de Balzac. La première expression de son admiration se trouve dans une lettre souvent citée qu'il écrit le 9 août 1838 à son frère :

Balzac est grand. Ses caractères sont le produit de l'âme de l'univers. Ce n'est pas l'esprit de l'époque, ce sont des milliers d'années de lutte qui ont abouti à produire ce résultat dans un cœur humain.

Pour Dostoïevski, nature déjà toute introspective à dix-huit ans, les impressions littéraires sont peut-être plus importantes que celles du monde extérieur. Balzac est toujours une de ses idoles lorsqu'en 1844 la traduction d'*Eugénie Grandet* lui fournit son premier gagne-pain littéraire. Peut-être l'idée de ce travail lui fut-elle donnée par le séjour de trois mois que Balzac fit à Pétersbourg en 1843, séjour pendant lequel la société officielle le bouda, mais qui dut susciter l'intérêt du monde littéraire. Au sujet de sa traduction, Dostoïevski écrit, à son frère encore : "J'ai traduit Eugénie Grandet de Balzac. (O merveille, merveille!) Et ma traduction est incomparable. On m'en donnera au moins 350 roubles..."

La version de Dostoïevski fut publiée dans *Répertoire et Panthéon*, tronquée d'un tiers, à l'indignation du traducteur. Mais celui-ci avait déjà trahi Balzac, en faisant passer dans les pages de ce roman le

vieux mandarin en Chine, le ferais-tu?", et la réponse de Bianchon : "Eh bien non..." Les arguments des deux interlocuteurs sont omis.

Dostoïevski rapprochait la conclusion de Bianchon du sacrifice de Tatiana refusant de suivre Oniéguine et d'abandonner son mari. Mais la définition du bonheur qu'il donne plus loin : "le bonheur, c'est la suprême harmonie spirituelle," est bien éloignée des phrases de Bianchon : "Notre bonheur, mon cher, tiendra toujours entre la plante de nos pieds et notre occiput ; et qu'il coûte un million par an ou cent louis, la perception intrinsèque en est la même au-dedans de nous." Peut-être est-ce pour cette raison que le passage en question ne fut pas prononcé et ne se trouve pas dans le texte définitif du discours. Peut-être aussi, dans un essai consacré tout entier au caractère essentiellement russe de l'œuvre de Pouchkine, Dostoïevski jugea-t-il plus convenable de ne pas chercher de parallèle chez un auteur étranger.

souffle romantique de Schiller, autre idole du jeune Dostoïevski. Le ton était monté, les épithètes pittoresques prodiguées. Les souffrances d'Eugénie étaient devenues "de profonds et terrible tourments," et un pathétique fiévreux chargeait le tout, à la fois rappel des romans sentimentaux européens de la fin du dix-huitième siècle et annonce naïve de l'émotion dont seront pénétrés les ouvrages ultérieurs de Dostoïevski.

Cette déformation romantique de Balzac ne lui est point particulière. Les revues russes voyaient avec raison en Balzac le chantre de la ville moderne, avec ses contrastes de palais et de masures, mais elles en faisaient aussi le prédicateur de la compassion envers les misérables et les dépossédés, le représentant, avec George Sand et Hugo, d'un "nouvel art chrétien." Certes, le critique Bélinski donnait en exemple aux jeunes auteurs russes ce "maître de la variété et de l'analyse"; il recommandait qu'on prit chez lui des leçons artistiques. Mais ce point de vue esthétique était celui qui dans l'ensemble préoccupait le moins la génération des années 40. Fidèle aux traditions de la culture russe, agitée d'autre part, dans l'ordre littéraire, par l'apparition sensationnelle de Gogol et, dans l'ordre politique, par des aspirations étouffées de réformes, elle est surtout soucieuse d'éthique. Une discussion des problèmes politiques, sociaux et moraux, un tableau de la vie contemporaine, voilà ce que le public russe cherchait dans le roman et ce qu'il trouvait en Balzac.³

Si l'on considère l'œuvre de Dostoïevski sous cet angle, on voit qu'en apparence au moins les thèmes en sont particulièrement balzaciens. Par là il se distingue de ses grands contemporains Tolstoï, Tourguénev, Aksakov, etc., et se rapproche de maint romancier mineur tel que Saltykov et surtout Pisemski. Ses drames, comme ceux de Balzac, sont des drames bourgeois; ses personnages sont généralement de petites gens—fonctionnaires, pauvres, déclassés; ce sont en tous cas des citadins et non, comme chez Tourguénev ou Tolstoï, des *promieshchiki* ou des paysans. La ville elle-même joue un rôle de premier plan dans son œuvre. Dans ce cadre urbain, les personnages nous sont racontés sur un ton expressif, en accord avec leur fièvre, qui est plus voisin de la manière de Balzac que ne l'est celle de ses contemporains russes. Les conflits dostoïevskiens sont, eux aussi, superficiellement au moins, des conflits balzaciens. L'argent est souvent le moteur de l'intrigue; l'idée du conquérant, le problème de la puissance, (thèmes faustiens ou napoléoniens, mais que Balzac avait fait siens) sont au centre de l'œuvre de Dostoïevski.

³ Surtout les partisans de l'occidentalisme, tels que le libéral Bélinski, qui d'ailleurs se déprît ensuite de Balzac, le qualifiant d'"Homère du Faubourg St. Germain, qu'il ne connaît que de vue" (citation empruntée au *Balzac en Russie* de Léonide Grossman, Paris, 1946).

Donc : milieu social des personnages, cadre physique de leur drame, ton de l'œuvre, nature des conflits—tout cela porte l'empreinte de Balzac et permet de parler, sinon d'emprunts précis, tout au moins d'affinités apparentes, ou plus exactement d'un déclenchement de l'imagination dostoïevskienne au contact de Balzac. Influence d'ailleurs favorisée, répétons-le, par le climat littéraire et politique du temps, mais dont Dostoïevski est le seul grand romancier russe à porter si nettement la marque.

Le *Père Goriot*, cette œuvre capitale de Balzac, fit sur Dostoïevski l'impression la plus forte. Parmi les expressions balzaciennes ("assez causé," "nous verrons cela," "c'est du sublime") dont à cette époque de sa vie il émaille ses lettres, dominent celles qu'il emprunte à ce roman. On sait aussi que ce fut le premier livre qu'il ait donné à lire à sa seconde femme lorsqu'il entreprit, dit-elle, son éducation. Dans la personne du père Goriot, ce "Christ de l'amour paternel," Dostoïevski put trouver en effet, autant que chez les "automates ambulants" de Gogol, le type d'où sortira la longue lignée de ses "humiliés et offensés"; dans les personnages de Vautrin et de Rastignac, il découvrit le "héros," le "conquérant," dont le problème sera, depuis Raskolnikov jusqu'à Ivan Karamazov, le thème constant et douloureux de son œuvre.

On pourrait rechercher dans le détail les échos possibles du *Père Goriot* dans les romans de Dostoïevski, les traces en quelque sorte matérielles qu'a pu y laisser la lecture attentive et passionnée de ce livre. Bianchon appelle le père Goriot un "père éternel"; peut-être y a-t-il une réminiscence de ce terme dans le choix du titre de *L'Eternel Mari*, récit de 1869, dont le héros "naît et grandit uniquement pour se marier et devenir le complément de sa femme," comme le père Goriot n'était que l'ombre et le complément de ses filles. Vautrin, exposant sa philosophie de la vie; ravale les hommes au niveau des punaises; de même Raskolnikov les compare à des poux. Sur le plan de l'intrigue, le thème du crime passif, permis par le silence, par l'approbation implicite du héros—Rastignac laissant tuer le frère de Victorine—se retrouve dans *Les Démons* (meurtre de la femme de Stavroguine) et dans *Les Frères Karamazov* (mort du vieux Karamazov). Les arguments de Vautrin et le drame moral de Rastignac ont leur écho évident dans les raisonnements de Raskolnikov pour justifier le crime qu'il envisage. Et ainsi de suite.

D'autre part, l'on a suggéré une influence possible de Balzac sur le choix de certains sujets de Dostoïevski: ainsi le type de l'avare Prokharitchine dans le récit du même nom devrait plusieurs traits à Grandet; le portrait du musicien Iéfimov, dans la première partie de *Nietotchka Niezvanova* (1849) aurait été inspiré par *Gambara*, nou-

velle que Balzac publia en 1837. A vrai dire, ces rapprochements appellent de grandes réserves : le fantoche Prokharthine, fonctionnaire minable, enveloppé d'une atmosphère à la fois sordide et fantastique, offre peut-être quelques réminiscences de Grandet. Il est plus sûrement apparenté aux avarés de Gogol ou même au "Chevalier avare" de Pouchkine.⁴ Quant au violoniste Iéfimov, le type du musicien à demi fou sorti des pages d'Hoffmann avait envahi toute la littérature russe de l'époque, et si l'on ne peut exclure complètement une influence de Balzac, celle-ci est sans doute bien faible. On pourrait tout au plus signaler, en ce qui concerne l'ensemble du roman, l'intérêt que, pour la première fois, Dostoïevski marque dans *Nietotchka Nievznova* pour le problème de la famille, problème sur lequel il reviendra ailleurs et auquel Balzac s'était également attaché.

En fait, ces recherches d'emprunts ou de réminiscences de détail ont un intérêt surtout anecdotique. Témoignage superficiel, comme l'imitation naïve de Lucien de Rubempré qu'affectait alors, dans les allures et le ton, le jeune auteur russe grisé par ses premiers succès. Mieux vaudra reprendre l'étude des ressemblances de personnages et de thèmes qui apparentent Dostoïevski à Balzac et indiquent les réactions profondes de sa sensibilité devant l'œuvre du romancier français.

On a dit que Dostoïevski fut le premier écrivain à délaisser les romans de *promieschchiki* et à prendre pour personnages des *raznotchintsy*, (marchands, petits fonctionnaires, étudiants, intellectuels, etc.). De même, malgré les grands seigneurs ou les paysans qu'on trouve dans l'œuvre de Balzac, ce sont les représentants des classes moyennes qui restent dans la mémoire.

Cependant, il convient de faire ici deux réserves importantes : d'une part, rien chez Dostoïevski ne peut se comparer à l'infinité variété des personnages de Balzac, au caractère pour ainsi dire encyclopédique de ses *dramatis personae*;⁵ d'autre part, c'est Gogol qui le premier avait éveillé l'intérêt pour les humbles, en particulier pour le petit fonctionnaire minable et absurde, qui joue un si grand rôle dans la littérature russe du dix-neuvième siècle. On disait couramment, dans les années 40, que tout le roman naturaliste russe était sorti du *Manteau* de Gogol. A l'origine d'une œuvre comme *Les Pauvres Gens*, par exemple, on trouve le roman sentimental du dix-huitième siècle et le héros du *Manteau* plus que l'influence de Balzac.

Ce qui est plus intéressant et plus probant, c'est le cadre où se meuvent ces personnages. Dostoïevski a écrit une trentaine d'ouvrages.

⁴ Sur le thème de l'avare dans la littérature européenne, voir I. Nossinov, "Skoupoi Rytsar," dans *Pouchkine i mirovaia literatoura*. (Moscou, 1941).

⁵ Il est curieux de constater qu'il n'y a guère d'hommes de métier dans l'œuvre de Dostoïevski. Le lecteur se demande souvent de quoi vivent ses personnages.

L'action de presque tous se passe dans une ville (l'exception la plus importante étant *Le Village de Stepanchikovo*). Pétersbourg sert d'arrière-fond à une bonne vingtaine. Les quartiers ou les maisons qui y sont souvent décrits avec exactitude sont ceux des classes moyennes ou pauvres. Dans l'œuvre de Balzac aussi domine le climat urbain; la capitale ou la ville de province fournit le cadre de la majorité de ses romans. C'est que la tragédie de l'homme contemporain se déroule dans la ville: c'est là surtout qu'il rencontre des conditions qui provoquent la lutte (Balzac) et l'inquiétude (Dostoïevski). Les contrastes et les conflits matériels ou moraux sont plus intenses dans l'atmosphère fiévreuse de la ville; là on peut saisir sur le vif la psychologie de l'homme pris dans la foule, de l'homme aux prises avec d'autres hommes.

Paris, chez Balzac, c'est une multitude de choses: c'est la description minutieuse d'une rue, d'un quartier, de ses habitants, l'accumulation massive de détails physiques, techniques, historiques; la physiologie de la ville et son influence sur les êtres humains. C'est la démonstration de cette relation presque mécanique de cause à effet, de ce déterminisme qui était si cher à Balzac. Parfois, mais rarement, surgit la vaste image de l'âme collective et monstrueuse de la cité.

Pétersbourg, pour Dostoïevski, est à la fois beaucoup moins et beaucoup plus. On a comparé, par exemple, la description de la maison de Rogojine, dans *L'Idiot*, à celle de la maison Grandet.⁶ Prises isolément, les deux citations semblent peut-être justifier le rapprochement; mais c'est fausser la comparaison que d'examiner un paragraphe isolé. On pourrait trouver dans l'œuvre de Dostoïevski cent passages du même ton. En fait, cette description suggère moins une réminiscence balzacienne que l'atmosphère de Pétersbourg telle que Dostoïevski nous la fait bien souvent sentir. Impossible de séparer Dostoïevski de Pétersbourg, dont l'âme l'imprègne tout entier. Mais pour lui, Pétersbourg n'est pas la Russie—il en est au contraire l'ennemi et la maladie. Cette interprétation de la capitale n'est pas exceptionnelle; si au début du siècle, et chez Pouchkine encore, la "cité de Pierre le Grand" apparaissait dans les lettres russes comme un monument de puissance et de victoire, elle était devenue plus tard, pour des raisons géographiques mais surtout historiques et politiques, le symbole d'une agitation artificielle et morbide.⁷

Arrivés à ce point, il faut jeter un regard sur la manière des deux écrivains, sur les contacts et les écarts de leur réalisme et de leur méthode. On sait que Balzac avait un don d'observation rapide, une curiosité insatiable, une manie de précision documentaire. On connaît le pas-

⁶ J. W. Bienstock, "Dostoïevski et Balzac," *Mercure de France*, CLXXVI (1924), 418-425.

⁷ N. P. Antsiferov, *Doucha Péterbourga* (Pétersbourg, 1922).

sage célèbre de *Facino Cane*, souvent cité,⁸ où, suivant un couple d'ouvriers, l'écrivain échafaude tout un roman. Mainte page du même ton pourrait se trouver dans l'œuvre de Dostoïevski. "J'aime," nous dit-il dans son *Journal d'un écrivain* (1873), "tout en errant par les rues, observer quelques passants inconnus, étudier leur visage, chercher à deviner qui ils sont, comment ils vivent et ce qu'ils font." Et la rencontre d'un ouvrier menant son petit garçon par la main évoque tout un drame dans son imagination. On songe à Balzac en lisant le passage, et aussi, il est vrai, à Dickens. D'autres pages du *Journal d'un écrivain* nous disent combien Dostoïevski était fier de la sûreté de ses déductions et de cette vision intuitive de l'âme d'autrui qu'il possédait tout autant que Balzac.

Comme leur créateur, les personnages de Dostoïevski errent sans cesse dans la ville, sans but, sans nécessité, observant les petits tableaux de la rue, s'arrêtant brusquement lorsque le regard ou le sourire d'un inconnu les frappe. Antsiferov, dans *Le Pétersbourg de Dostoïevski*,⁹ affirme que leurs itinéraires ont une exactitude topographique. Il semble donc que pour Balzac comme pour Dostoïevski les données premières du tempérament soient semblables. Cependant le décor et le portrait physique des personnages sont chez Balzac au premier plan. On oublie rarement chez lui le point de vue déterministe, les rapports étroits qui relient l'être humain à son milieu, rapports soulignés par l'accumulation plus ou moins massive de détails matériels. On a l'impression de se trouver devant un maître qui sait tout d'avance et nous fait part de sa science. Chez Dostoïevski la correspondance du décor et de l'âme est exprimée par des moyens tout différents. Point de minutie scientifique. D'ailleurs Dostoïevski, loin de partager l'engouement de sa génération pour les sciences positives, ne perdait pas une occasion de les railler. Il emploie une méthode oblique et suggestive, la seule qui puisse nous donner l'impression qu'il ne sait, lui, rien d'avance, qu'il ne peut rien déterminer parce que rien n'est réellement fixe... Méthode particulièrement heureuse pour traduire l'atmosphère de Pétersbourg, ville "voulue," "fantastique," née loin des sources vives de l'existence nationale, sans racines dans la terre maternelle; l'âme se fond et se dissout à l'image de son élément

⁸ "Chez moi l'observation était devenue intuitive, elle pénétrait l'âme sans négliger le corps; ou plutôt elle saisissait si bien les détails extérieurs qu'elle allait vivre sur-le-champ au delà; elle me donnait la faculté de vivre de la vie de l'individu sur lequel elle s'exerçait... Lorsque, entre onze heures et minuit, je rencontrais un ouvrier et sa femme revenant ensemble de l'Ambigu-Comique, je m'amusais à les suivre... En entendant ces gens, je pouvais épouser leur vie, je me sentais leurs guenilles sur le dos, je marchais les pieds dans leurs souliers percés; leurs désirs, leurs besoins, tout passait dans mon âme, ou mon âme passait dans la leur... Quitter ses habitudes, devenir un autre que soi par l'ivresse des facultés morales, telle était ma distraction..."

⁹ N. P. Antsiferov, *Pétersbourg Dostoïevskogo* (Pétersbourg, 1923).

essentiel qui, fleuve, brouillard, boue, pluie, neige mouillée, est toujours l'eau, de tous les éléments le plus fluide et le plus fuyant.

C'est ce côté fantasmagorique de la cité, ce mirage poétique surgi d'une prose dont la grisaille même favorise la vision d'une réalité seconde, qui se dessine sans cesse chez Dostoïevski. Les implications et les présences obscures transparaissent sous une substance qui n'est plus la substance massive de Balzac, mais qui permet le passage immédiat du plan physique ou psychologique au plan métaphysique. L'évocation des rues de la ville dans *Les Démons*, la maison de Chotov dans le même roman, la "Descente de Croix" de Holbein chez Rogojine dans *L'Idiot*, les rues et les places de Pétersbourg telles que les voit Raskolnikov au cours de ses fiévreuses randonnées—autant d'exemples d'un procédé grâce auquel le monde tangible s'entr'ouvre sur une réalité qui en dépasse les dimensions coutumières.

Passons du cadre aux personnages. Chez Balzac ceux-ci se révèlent par leur aspect physique, leurs vêtements, leurs tics ou leurs attitudes. Les procédés de langage—accent, vocabulaire, dialecte, formule caractéristique—dont Balzac se sert abondamment, sont des attributs en quelque sorte scéniques, au même titre que le vêtement et la mimique de l'acteur. La technique de Balzac rappelle ici les effets visuels ou mécaniques de théâtre. Chez Dostoïevski, si le portrait physique est esquissé par des traits souvent inoubliables, c'est essentiellement la parole qui révèle la personnalité. On a longtemps tenu pour négligé et même pour négligeable le style de ses romans; cependant il s'intéresse passionnément aux ressources de la langue et les utilise en maître. Russe archaïque des moines, assonances et rythmes populaires, phrases essoufflées de Kirilov, jargon socialisant des révolutionnaires—l'énumération pourrait se prolonger autant que la liste de ses personnages. C'est une langue infiniment expressive, dont une syntaxe souvent désarticulée accroît encore la qualité émotive, et dont l'art n'a été reconnu que tardivement.¹⁰ Les personnages "naissent"¹¹ de leurs paroles; l'exploration de leur âme, faite par eux-mêmes, par les autres acteurs du drame, par l'auteur enfin, prend les allures d'une confession: procédé plus "intellectuel," plus excitant pour les nerfs, plus trouble aussi et qui exclut les conclusions définitives. Le monde de Dostoïevski n'est pas bien charpenté, le sol n'en est point solide sous les pas. Et si Balzac veut tout accorder, tout rendre, en fin de compte, compréhensible, Dostoïevski au contraire est toujours sensible au chaos, aux ombres souterraines, à l'anarchie de l'univers humain. La frénésie des personnages de Balzac est surtout simplification dramatique ou dé-

¹⁰ Voir la brève étude de Grossman, "Zamietki o iazyke Dostoievskogo," dans *op. cit.*

¹¹ Expression de Konstantin Motchoulski dans son livre remarquable, *Dostoïevski, jizn i tvortchestvo* (Paris, 1947).

bordement de vie excessive. Chez Dostoïevski, cette frénésie est l'éruption de forces maléfiques, la torture de l'âme déchirée par l'éternel combat de Dieu et de Satan.

Venons aux conflits sociaux ou intérieurs qui opposent ou agitent les personnages. Chez Balzac c'est le thème de l'argent qui est au cœur de l'œuvre. Dans une société bourgeoise fondée sur l'égoïsme, l'argent est la source de la puissance et de la destruction. Faute d'en posséder, les hommes sont désarmés et anéantis, et la nécessité d'en obtenir crée les rebelles, qu'ils soient des brigands comme Vautrin, des conquérants comme Rastignac, ou des maniaques tels que Gobseck, la cousine Bette, Claës ou Grandet. L'absence de ce mobile rendrait l'œuvre entière inconcevable.

Chez Dostoïevski, à première vue, l'argent semble également important. Dans *Les Pauvres Gens*, *Humiliés et offensés*, *L'Idiot*, l'intrigue prend son point de départ dans le besoin d'argent ou dans les conflits d'intérêts. Dans *L'Adolescent*, Arkady rêve de devenir riche "comme Rothschild." La pauvreté de Raskolnikov est à l'origine de son crime. C'est l'argent encore qui oppose Dimitri Karamazov à son père. Le thème de la misère des petits fonctionnaires est traité dans la plupart des œuvres mineures. En somme, le cadre, l'appareil et les péripéties du drame d'intérêt se trouvent rassemblés. L'image démesurée des conflits d'argent dans l'œuvre balzacienne a certes dû frapper Dostoïevski, dont d'ailleurs la vie quotidienne, comme celle de Balzac, était hantée par les soucis pécuniaires et les dettes. Mais si l'on y regarde de près, le romancier russe exploite peu ce thème, fondamental chez le Français. Nous montre-t-il la destruction, ou du moins les transformations opérées par l'argent dans l'âme de ses héros, son pouvoir d'empoisonner les relations humaines? Non, car si Balzac reste sur le plan psychologique et social, Dostoïevski le quitte sans cesse. Pour lui, le motif de l'argent n'est qu'un prétexte commode, évident, pour le déclenchement de l'intrigue, une base matérielle indispensable pour les péripéties du récit; mais il ne sort guère de ce rôle subordonné, et on a parfois l'impression que Dostoïevski lui-même l'oublie tout comme son lecteur. Quand il pense à écrire *L'Idiot*, où s'enchevêtrent de multiples conflits d'intérêts, son idée première est de nous "représenter un homme admirable à tous les points de vue," nullement de nous dépeindre une société en proie au mal de l'argent. (Il est intéressant de constater que le film français tiré de ce roman accentue, inévitablement sans doute, l'aspect balzacien de l'intrigue aux dépens des impondérables dostoïevskiens et ramène les personnages aux types classiques du roman social.) Balzac a l'ambition de nous "présenter une histoire de la société peinte en action," "le drame d'une génération à quatre ou cinq mille personnages." Dostoïevski, projetant

une œuvre monumentale, songe à écrire "la vie d'un grand pécheur." Dans cette atmosphère toute personnaliste, le motif de l'argent n'est plus guère qu'une toile de fond devant laquelle se déroule, comme par hasard, le drame d'une âme humaine.

Ce thème, d'autre part, est indissolublement lié à un autre motif balzacien : celui de la volonté de puissance, du héros, du conquérant. Chez Balzac la conception de la lutte pour la vie, dans une société qui comprime et opprime, entraîne automatiquement celle de la révolte. Le révolté—Vautrin, Rastignac, les Treize—ayant vu l'iniquité fondamentale de la civilisation bourgeoise, lutte en fauve dans un monde de fauves. C'est l'être qui, tel le narrateur des *Cahiers écrits dans un souterrain*, ne voit que deux possibilités : "ou être un héros, ou se vautrer dans la boue." Quel que soit le sentiment profond de Balzac sur ses héros, l'envergure qu'il leur donne suppose au moins une instinctive sympathie. Il nous présente en tous cas un conflit né de l'acceptation des faits, qui se déroule sur le plan matériel, avec des résultats tangibles sous forme d'argent et de puissance. C'est un drame social roulant sur un problème posé par une nécessité extérieure.

Considérons maintenant Raskolnikov : poussée plus au noir, sa situation matérielle ressemble à celle de Rastignac. Son problème est également de vaincre le sort. Comment ? Par le meurtre d'une vieille prêtreuse à gages, "une horrible vieille femme, non seulement inutile, mais criminelle..." Dans les arguments qu'il emploie pour se convaincre nous voyons s'entremêler le motif Rastignac du meurtre justifié au nom d'un intérêt supérieur et le motif Vautrin du mépris de la foule. Le but, les arguments, les moyens, semblent donc similaires. Mais de ces données pareilles, quel est l'aboutissement ? Le motif Rastignac, au cours du roman, s'efface peu à peu devant le motif Vautrin. Celui-ci à son tour se transforme et le problème qui s'impose graduellement (le problème de l'œuvre toute entière) c'est celui de la liberté, dont la conception exclut toute idée de puissance matérielle.

En séparant l'humanité en deux groupes : les "hommes," à qui tout est permis, et la masse tremblante, les "poux," Raskolnikov a nié le principe de la dignité essentielle de l'âme humaine. Il commet son crime pour se prouver qu'il est un "homme." Si l'épreuve avait réussi, il n'aurait peut-être, dit-il à Sonia, plus jamais tué. Donc nous sommes en présence du crime gratuit, engendré par une nécessité morale et non matérielle : le problème est posé indépendamment de son aboutissement dans l'acte. Là où le héros de Balzac ne songe pas un instant à se voir autrement qu'en relation avec la société, le héros de Dostoïevski est seul avec son âme et la lutte se déroule entre l'abstraction de sa théorie, les arguments "morts" qu'il avance, et la vie réelle. Son crime, déjà commis avant qu'il ait fait un seul geste contre sa

victime, est un crime de principe, non de fait, et comme tel infiniment plus grave.

Dans *Crime et Châtiment* Dostoïevski lance sa première grande attaque contre cette idée du conquérant qui fut un des thèmes du dix-neuvième siècle et qui, dépouillée des voiles glorieux dont le succès de ses représentants l'entoure d'habitude, se ramène à la conviction qu'il est permis de considérer l'être humain comme un moyen. Dans les livres qui suivront, le conquérant, déjà démasqué sous la figure de Raskolnikov, ne sera plus qu'un compare plus mesquin que les pires bourgeois (Gania dans *L'Idiot*), un jeune irrésolu (*L'Adolescent*) ou un grotesque effroyable (le Chigalov des *Démons*). Sur un plan différent, il aboutira à des figures comme Kirilov et Ivan Karamazov. Et dans les combats de ces derniers avec leur âme, on n'entend plus d'échos du passé (Balzac, Napoléon), mais des préludes de l'avenir (Nietzsche, Gide, Camus).

Arrêtons-nous un moment à la figure de l'Adolescent, héros d'un roman confus, désordonné, le roman d'une "famille de hasard,"¹² que Dostoïevski avait conçu partiellement comme réplique aux romans de la famille harmonieuse tels que *Guerre et Paix*. L'Adolescent est un enfant naturel, isolé, humilié, qui vient à Pétersbourg conquérir sa liberté par l'argent. "Mon idée, c'est d'être Rothschild, d'être aussi riche que Rothschild, pas simplement riche, mais précisément riche comme Rothschild." Pourquoi? Pour se sentir puissant, ou plutôt pour avoir "ce qui s'acquiert par la puissance et ne peut s'acquérir sans elle, la conscience calme et solitaire de sa force." Mais une fois la fortune acquise, il refusera de l'utiliser. "Je jetterai mes millions dans la boue." Ce n'est plus ici un mobile d'agression, mais un réflexe de défense, celui d'un humble qui veut se protéger. La méthode qu'il veut employer est également humble: c'est l'accumulation sou par sou, l'opiniâtreté minuscule et quotidienne, dénuée de toute audace et de toute entreprise. Telle est sa "grande idée." Mais chaque contact avec la vie l'éloigne de son projet, et finalement il en accepte la faillite. Le thème de l'argent et de la puissance s'efface alors dans le roman, comme s'il n'avait jamais au fond été pris au sérieux par l'auteur.

Si nous avons insisté sur ce personnage assez falot, c'est qu'à sa manière il illustre la défaite totale de la volonté de puissance dans l'œuvre de Dostoïevski. Pour l'adolescent, conquérant imaginaire, la richesse n'est plus qu'un moyen de fuir un monde qui le blesse. L'aboutissement de tous ces départs vers la conquête, c'est le renoncement et la soumission, seuls chemins de la liberté. Et la recherche de la puissance s'assimile au refus de participer à la communauté humaine.

¹² *Journal d'un écrivain*, juillet-août 1877.

C'est déjà l'annonce du maître-mot de Dostoïevski, celui qu'il prononcera dans le discours sur Pouchkine :

Ce n'est point hors de toi qu'est la vérité, mais en toi-même ; trouve-toi en toi-même, soumets-toi à toi-même, maîtrise-toi et tes yeux verront la vérité. Elle n'est point dans les choses, cette vérité, elle n'est point hors de toi, quelque part au-delà des mers, mais avant tout dans ton propre travail sur toi-même. Quand tu te seras vaincu, quand tu te seras dompté, alors tu seras libre comme jamais tu n'avais pu l'imaginer et tu commenceras une grande œuvre, et tu rendras les autres libres, et tu connaîtras le bonheur, car ta vie sera pleine et tu comprendras enfin ton peuple et sa sainte vérité.

Ni Balzac ni Dostoïevski ne se sont contentés d'exposer le drame de l'être humain sans nous proposer leurs remèdes au mal. Ici encore une vue hâtive pourrait laisser supposer une certaine ressemblance entre les conceptions politiques et sociales des deux romanciers. Tout comme les vues de Balzac, celles de Dostoïevski sont anti-libérales et anti-bourgeoises. Tous deux, dans leurs conclusions finales, se montrent ennemis des mouvements révolutionnaires de leur temps, mettent en garde contre les théories socialistes et s'appuient sur la religion comme moyen de salut.

Mais en fait les chemins qui les ont conduits à ces conclusions, la conception du monde qu'elles recouvrent, sont aux deux extrêmes de la pensée. Il est significatif que ces deux apologistes d'un ordre fondé sur l'obéissance à l'autorité et le respect de la religion soient considérés si différemment par la critique soviétique actuelle. On salue en Balzac un écrivain progressiste ; on admire, suivant en cela Marx et Engels, sa compréhension des rapports réels entre les hommes, et son don de mettre à nu les ulcères de la société contemporaine. C'est le tragique social, dans ses romans, qui attire l'attention et le respect. Mais on accuse le romancier des humiliés et des offensés, l'ennemi acharné du bourgeois, d'avoir dénaturé les grandes leçons des poètes de la liberté (tels que Pouchkine) en cherchant dans leur œuvre non point l'appel à la révolte, mais une leçon d'humilité. Et surtout on se méfie d'une œuvre dont le principe est le tragique de la personnalité humaine, tragique exclu de la littérature soviétique et nié par elle. L'opposition de ces deux attitudes éclaire la dissemblance profonde des deux auteurs. Pour Balzac, la société est un organisme vivant dont la base ne doit pas être l'individu, mais une communauté, telle que la famille, où puisse jouer l'instinct biologique ; la famille, première cellule du grand corps social et qui, réunissant en elle les caractères d'inégalité et d'unité, est ainsi l'image de l'univers entier. Une société fondée sur la famille, dans laquelle les traditions de chaque caste contiendraient l'égoïsme qui est le ressort de tous les êtres, c'est pour Balzac le remède à la rapacité et à la médiocrité destructrices du monde bourgeois ; elle est aussi le salut contre le chaos qu'entraînerait la montée au pouvoir du

prolétariat. Au-dessus de cette hiérarchie aristocratique règne l'Eglise dont la tutelle éducatrice favorise le progrès et sans laquelle le gouvernement serait obligé de recourir à la terreur pour se maintenir.¹³

Ainsi, écrivant son œuvre, comme il le dit dans la préface à la *Comédie Humaine*, "à la lueur de deux vérités éternelles, la Religion et la Monarchie," Balzac trouve en définitive la vérité "dans les choses, en dehors de soi..." Dans sa société idéale, la volonté individuelle—don de Dieu, mais dont l'affirmation anarchique serait périlleuse—s'unit avec l'autorité pour construire le monde et les âmes.

Pour Dostoïevski (vivant d'ailleurs dans une société où les formes du capitalisme industriel ou financier n'étaient pas au même degré manifestes), le problème se présente tout différemment. Préoccupé, nous l'avons vu, du moral plus que du social, il ne nous montre pas la société comme un jeu de forces soumis à des lois immuables; nous ne trouvons pas dans son œuvre de duel entre une forme de civilisation et les aspirations de l'être humain. Les forces en jeu chez Dostoïevski sont toutes éthiques; la lutte se passe à l'intérieur de chaque être. Ses attaques acharnées contre le socialisme ont des raisons purement morales: pour lui, si le socialisme est dangereux, ce n'est point parce qu'il est utopique, ou qu'il mine la société telle qu'elle existe, ou qu'il amène le chaos et la terreur; il est dangereux parce que, pour Dostoïevski, il réduit la vie et la liberté à un code. C'est la victoire du rationalisme desséchant et de l'abstraction sur les impulsions vivantes de l'âme. Le socialisme, pour Dostoïevski, c'est la solution anti-individualiste, alors que toute son œuvre proclame la profonde nécessité de l'individualisme éthique, de ce que nous appellerions aujourd'hui le personnalisme.¹⁴ Contre le concept napoléonien du surhomme, contre la mesquinerie bourgeoise et libérale, contre l'athéisme destructeur, contre le catholicisme "asservisseur" des âmes, contre Dieu lui-même tel que le voit Ivan Karamazov, Dostoïevski défend la liberté infiniment difficile et désirable du Christianisme vivant en chaque individu.

Donc, à l'immense fresque agitée et colorée de cette *Comédie Humaine* dans laquelle, adolescent, il voyait un exemple du nouvel art chrétien qui devait rénover le monde, le Dostoïevski de la maturité oppose l'exploration de l'âme et de ses profondeurs multiples. En face d'une hiérarchie de protection destinée à assurer le bonheur matériel de chaque individu, il montre l'homme seul, infiniment précieux, infiniment libre et exposé. Pour Balzac, la tâche de l'intelligence est d'organiser l'équilibre des forces en conflit afin de progresser en commun; pour Dostoïevski, elle est d'étudier l'être spirituel afin de

¹³ Sur Balzac voir V. Grib, *Balzac, a Marxist Analysis* (New York, 1937).

¹⁴ "Individualisme éthique," expression employée par Ivanov-Razoumnik, *Rousskaia literatura ot semideciatykh godov do nachikkh dnei* (Berlin, 1923).

lui révéler sa vraie liberté et d'atteindre à la fraternité universelle par le chemin du perfectionnement individuel.

L'idée orthodoxe devant l'idée catholique (ou plutôt l'idée slave en face de l'idée romaine), l'idée médiévale de vie spirituelle devant l'idée "Renaissance" de l'énergie souveraine, la métaphysique devant l'empirisme—tels sont, avec toutes les réserves qu'imposent des classifications aussi grosses, les termes qui pourraient qualifier l'œuvre de ces deux esprits de races différentes. La graine déposée par Balzac—pour reprendre la comparaison de Léonide Grossman—ne pouvait fructifier de façon plus surprenante.¹⁵

University of Minnesota

¹⁵ Cette esquisse doit beaucoup à l'ouvrage déjà cité de K. Motchoulski. A signaler aussi : Troyat, *Dostoïevski* (Paris, 1940).

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CRITIC'S NOTEBOOK. Edited by Robert W. Stallman. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1950. xv, 303 p.

CRITIQUES AND ESSAYS IN CRITICISM, 1920-1948. Edited by Robert W. Stallman. New York: Ronald, 1949. xxii, 571 p.

CRITICISM. THE FOUNDATIONS OF MODERN LITERARY JUDGMENT. Edited by Mark Schorer, Josephine Miles, and Gordon McKenzie. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1948. xi, 553 p.

The first of these anthologies, *The Critic's Notebook*, is somewhat like Saintsbury's *Loci Critici*—a collection of short passages illustrating different opinions on various critical problems. It is much narrower in scope, however, being limited to British and American critics of the past thirty years, and for the most part to a single school, the so-called "New Criticism." Although a few passages, "representing the point of view of the opposition, serve as counter-allegations to the dominating critical stand" (p. ix), most of them express the dominant view, and the opposition is by no means fully or adequately represented. The passages are well arranged, and are supplemented by an index and an extensive bibliography; the book is interesting to leaf through. But it is hard to see any important use for such a collection.

The other volumes also concentrate upon the New Critics, here illustrated not by brief excerpts but by complete essays. Since both collections have been designed primarily for use as textbooks, they should be considered first as tools of teaching. All three volumes may then be considered in a broader perspective, as illustrating the status of literary theory and judgment at the present time.

As a textbook, Stallman's *Critiques and Essays* seems to me preferable, on the whole, to Schorer's *Criticism*, but the two anthologies are much alike. In their central core—essays illustrating the New Criticism, the "dominating critical stand"—they are all but identical. Each includes twenty-odd essays by members of this school—about half the material in Schorer's collection, about two-thirds of that in Stallman's. Fifteen critics are represented in both, six of them by the same essays. The leading ideas of the school could be illustrated very fairly and fully by either of these anthologies.

Each also prints some essays illustrating other points of view. The most striking difference is the inclusion by Schorer and his collaborators of some two hundred pages of older criticism, from Plato to Henry James and Bradley. This material, for which there is no equivalent in Stallman, provides a highly desirable background for recent criticism, but the selection is arbitrary and capricious.¹ To give an adequate picture of the "foundations of modern literary judgment," to say nothing of the larger critical tradition, the collection would have to be supplemented by other texts, such as Gilbert or Smith and Parks.

¹ Eighteen pages, for example, are given to Edward Young, as against eight for Coleridge and only six (from the *Life of Gray*) for Dr. Johnson. Horace and Longinus are omitted entirely, although the first had a more lasting and pervasive influence than any other ancient critic, while the second is certainly one of the foundations of modern criticism.

And these, of course, could be used just as well with Stallman's book. Among more recent critics, outside the new school, *Criticism* includes a much fuller representation of sociological and Marxist criticism, Stallman's book a more adequate sampling of contemporary British criticism, particularly of the *Scrutiny* group. Schorer, Miles, and McKenzie offer greater variety, but the advantage is not decisive; on the whole, the differences more or less neutralize each other.

If Stallman's collection seems preferable, therefore, it is chiefly because of the fuller editorial apparatus and the more attractive format and typography. *Criticism* declares itself immediately as a textbook, with its thinner paper, smaller type and margins, and ugly double-column page; Stallman's book, much pleasanter physically, also provides convenient biographical sketches and a useful fifty-page bibliography. But in its basic content the other collection would serve their common purpose just about as well, and there is really very little to choose between them.

As indicated above, these books have a wider interest as exemplifying the condition of criticism in our time. Contemporary criticism is represented in much the same way in all three books. The editors agree not only in conceiving it as dominated by the New Criticism, but also in the high value they place upon this school. Though Schorer and his co-editors are less explicit, Stallman speaks for them as well as for himself when he says that "this critical achievement has not been equalled by critics in any period of our literary history."² In effect, contemporary criticism is the New Criticism, and it is great criticism.

One may readily concede that contemporary British and American criticism is dominated by the writers of this school. These anthologies are in themselves impressive testimony to the prestige and influence of the New Critics. If we narrow the concept of literary criticism by excluding philosophical aesthetics at one extreme, periodical reviewing at the other, and if we limit it further to writing in English, as these editors do, it is quite true that the liveliest and most characteristic development in criticism during the past twenty or thirty years has been the rise of this school. Its greatness, its validity and fruitfulness, is a different matter.

In the Foreword to Stallman's *Critiques*, Cleanth Brooks attempts to answer some of the objections which have been raised against the school, of which he is one of the saner and more moderate representatives. He finds the chief opposition in two places: in the vested interests of scholars, committed to a "positivistic" (philological or historical) approach to literature; and in a "romantic" idea of poetry, still widespread among teachers, journalists, and readers, as a product of emotion which is not susceptible to intellectual analysis. Against these opponents, Brooks defends the New Criticism as an attempt to treat the poem as a poem, in terms of its formal properties, and thus to "put the reader in possession of the work of art." The New Critics, he says, accomplish this aim by showing "how language actually works in a piece of literature." In its approach to poetry through linguistics, contemporary criticism is "part of a general intensification of the study of language and symbolism," paralleling recent developments in semantics, symbolic logic, cultural anthropology, and psychology. Treating poetry as art, in terms of form, it offers both analytical tools and evaluative criteria.³

² Stallman, *Critiques and Essays*, p. vi; cf. pp. 491, 506.

³ Stallman, *Critiques and Essays*, pp. xv-xxii. Cf. Brooks, "The New Criticism: A Brief for the Defense," *American Scholar*, XIII (1944), 285-295, and "Literary Criticism," in *English Institute Essays, 1946* (New York, 1947), pp. 127-158.

There is much truth in this account of the aims, assumptions, and intellectual affiliations of the movement, and up to a point it is also persuasive as a defense. Surely it is true that literary study, with all good reading and all good criticism, should seek a sounder and more adequate interpretation and appreciation of literary works, of poems as poems. Nor can these aims be attained without some sort of analysis guided by rational principles and without judgment guided by some sort of normative criteria. Insofar as teachers, scholars, and critics had forgotten or denied these truths, the revolt of the New Critics has been necessary and beneficial; it is the desire for these things, long felt by all who care for poetry, that has given these writers their prestige and influence. But there are objections to criticism of their particular kind, to their special interpretive and evaluative principles, which Brooks does little or nothing to resolve.

The weakness of his defense is most obvious in his treatment of the scholars, for he shows no comprehension of their fundamental complaint against his school. This complaint, stated and restated in almost innumerable studies of particular writers, works, and periods, is succinctly expressed in the title of M. Y. Hughes' paper, "Kidnapping Donne."⁴ Douglas Bush made the same charge, in a recent presidential address to the Modern Language Association, when he said that these critics too often indulge in "the invention of unhistorical theories and the reading of modern attitudes and ideas into the past."⁵ That this charge is not unfounded can be shown by many examples in these anthologies: by the jejune generalizations of T. E. Hulme's influential essay, "Romanticism and Classicism," by the analyses of Shakespeare's ideas by Knight and Traversi, by Empson's fantastic reading of Marvell's "Garden," by the perverse distortions of Shelley's sense in the writings of Leavis, Tate, R. P. Warren, and others. Similar examples are scattered everywhere in the writings of this school; they are wholly unacceptable to scholars, and there is nothing in Mr. Brooks' defense to make them more palatable.⁶

Some friends of this school—Brooks among them, in more conciliatory moments—have hoped for a *rapprochement* between scholars and critics.⁷ Such an alliance would be highly desirable, and in principle there is no obstacle; interpretation and evaluation are naturally complementary. But no criticism can be valid unless the poem has first been correctly understood; and if there is to be a collaboration between scholars and the critics of this school, there must first be an agreement in interpretation, or at any rate an acceptance of common interpretive criteria, common techniques of verification, by which differences could be resolved. Does any such agreement exist?

⁴ *Essays in Criticism*, 2nd Series, University of California Publications in English, IV (1934), 61-92.

⁵ "The New Criticism: Some Old-Fashioned Queries," *PMLA*, LXIV, Supp., Part 2 (Mar. 1949), pp. 13-21.

⁶ For comments by scholars on these or similar interpretations, see O. J. Campbell, "Shakespeare and the 'New Critics,'" in Joseph Quincy Adams: *Memorial Studies* (Washington, 1948); Rosmond Tuve, *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery. Renaissance Poetic and Twentieth-Century Critics* (Chicago, 1947); Ruth Wallerstein, *Studies in Seventeenth-Century Poetic* (Madison, 1950), especially pp. 151-154, 168-169, 177; and Richard H. Fogle, "Romantic Bards and Metaphysical Reviewers," in *The Imagery of Keats and Shelley* (Chapel Hill, 1949), pp. 241-278. The list could easily be extended.

⁷ See Brooks, "The New Criticism and Scholarship," in *Twentieth Century English*, ed. Knickerbocker (New York, 1946), pp. 371-383. Cf. the statements by Austin Warren and Robert Heilman quoted by Stallman, *Critic's Notebook*, pp. 27-29.

For the New Critics, interpretation is guided by the assumption that the language of poetry, as distinguished from that of science, is ironic, paradoxical, or ambiguous; in other words, it conveys multiple and incongruous meanings. The clashing elements of meaning are variously described: as the sense and the feeling (Richards), as extension and intension (Tate), as structure and texture (Ransom), as prose statement and ironic qualification (Brooks), as the original impulse and resistances to it (Warren), and so forth. These conflicting elements are reconciled, or almost reconciled—Ransom, at least, always insists upon an unassimilated residue—in a unified total meaning; but in a true poem this unity is nonlogical or supralogical, a unity of tone, feeling, or attitude, a coherence of the "whole mind" or of the creative imagination, which preserves the incongruities while somehow resolving them in a transcendent synthesis. These ideas, one may note in passing, depend upon certain unstated and unexamined epistemological assumptions, of an irrationalist, post-Kantian sort, which are much closer to the actual teachings of the romantics than the feeble travesty of their thought which Brooks attacks.

Whatever their historical roots, these ideas are quite different from those underlying scholarly techniques of interpretation. As practiced by scholars, exegesis does not prejudice a poet's way of using language. Recognizing a variety of traditional devices, frequently used by poets but also employed by orators, historians, philosophers, and even mathematicians, this method of interpretation determines meaning (with more or less sophistication and skill in particular cases) by a long-established technique of grammatical analysis. It seeks to recover the meaning of a poet's words *as he used them*—both the general character of his style, which differs from age to age, genre to genre, and poet to poet, and the specific sense, among many possible senses, which he intended by particular devices and expressions; readings which cannot have been intended are rejected. For scholars, interpretation is a process of historical reconstruction, systematically controlled by evidence drawn from other works by the same author, from the writings of his contemporaries, especially in the same genre or convention, from his sources, and so on. Without such controls, scholars believe, interpretation is almost bound to read into poems meanings which their authors never intended—that *melon*, for example, in Marvell's "Garden," means among other things the apple of Eve and the sexuality of nature. On Empson's assumptions, this reading is perfectly possible, perhaps even necessary; but by scholarly criteria of sound exegesis it is impossible, demonstrably mistaken.

Can these very different ways of reading be reconciled? To me they seem not only different but radically incompatible, so that critics of Empson's school and scholars like Bush are certain to be talking of entirely different poems. Mr. Brooks, however, does not even recognize that the two methods are different, much less show that they can be reconciled. But until the difference has been resolved, those who hope for a *rapprochement* between scholars and New Critics are merely whistling in the dark.

There is another sort of objection, equally formidable, on which Brooks is equally silent. This objection has been stated in a series of very searching analyses by R. S. Crane and Elder Olson.⁸ It is directed against the evaluative criteria of the New Critics, not against their interpretive method.

⁸ R. S. Crane, "Cleanth Brooks; or, the Bankruptcy of Critical Monism," *Modern Philology*, XLV (1948), 226-245, and "I. A. Richards on the Art of Interpretation," *Ethics*, LIX (1949), 112-126; Elder Olson, "Recent Literary Criticism," *Modern Philology*, XL (1943), 275-283, and "William Empson, Contemporary Criticism and Poetic Diction," *Modern Philology*, XLVII (1950), 222-252.

Although their authority as scholars would be questioned by no one, Crane and Olson are in no sense positivistic. They are as anxious as Brooks himself to focus literary study upon the work, and to judge it by literary standards; they are also opposed to relativism and subjectivism. But in several ways the critics of Brooks' school seem to them unsatisfactory. In particular, there are two facts about the premise or basic normative principle of these critics which Crane and Olson find objectionable. Both of these are explicitly stated by Brooks, as well as by others of his group.

The first of these facts is the assumption, made by all the New Critics, that poetry is essentially one, and that it must be judged by a single universal standard.⁹ The objection is not that this assumption is false or illegitimate; any system of criticism which professes to judge literature by literary criteria must identify some characteristic or combination of characteristics, common to all literary works, by which they may be distinguished from nonliterary things. But the New Critics, preoccupied with the distinction between poetry and nonpoetry (especially science), offer no principles or devices by which distinctions can be drawn *within* literature. They insist, indeed, that such distinctions are invalid, or at least irrelevant to critical evaluation. The question to be raised is simply whether a poem is poetic, and the degree of its poeticity.

Whether legitimate or not, this idea severely limits the scope of critical discussion. Like any other premise, it determines what can and cannot be done by those who employ it as the standard of judgment; if there are certain problems which can be solved in terms of this principle, there are others which it cannot possibly treat.

Specifically, this assumption precludes any distinctions of kind among literary works, except as departures in various degrees from the universal norm. A whole range of questions, of the greatest interest and importance for both writers and readers, is thus automatically ruled out. To take an obvious example, the problem of "foreshortening," so much discussed by Henry James and so central to any discussion of the art of the novel, cannot be treated without distinguishing a novel from a play. The technical problems of the lyric poet are similarly ruled out, for they turn upon the nature of lyric, as a distinct literary type, or upon still more specific distinctions of aim and kind within the lyric. To the treatment of such problems, the New Criticism has nothing to contribute.¹⁰ On this assumption, furthermore, all poems must be judged by the same standard. Since all poetry is one, Brooks says, "we are allowed to approach a poem by Donne in the same general terms through which we approach a poem by Keats; or a poem of Wordsworth's, through the same terms which will apply to a poem by Yeats."¹¹ In other words, poems may be judged insofar as they are all alike; but, by the same token, Brooks' principle forbids him to take account of ways in which poems differ. He can discuss the "Immortality Ode" and "The Indifferent" in their common, gen-

⁹ Brooks, *The Well Wrought Urn* (New York, 1947), p. 197 and elsewhere.

¹⁰ It is true that in their well-known textbooks, *Understanding Drama*, *Understanding Fiction*, etc., Brooks and Warren sometimes tacitly admit such distinctions and attempt to solve such problems. But these distinctions are independent of and without warrant from their general aesthetic philosophy. For the most part, this mingling of inconsistent principles leads rather to muddle and confusion than to coherence and clarity, and to the extent that they do succeed in shedding light on particular problems of this kind, it is done by breaking through the narrow confines of the semantic system.

¹¹ Brooks, *The Well Wrought Urn*, p. 199. Cf. Crane, "Cleanth Brooks," *loc. cit.*, p. 237.

eral characteristics, but he can make no allowance in his judgment for the differences of kind, of form, style, or intention, between these violently contrasted works. This has led, as it was bound to do, to some notable injustices, of which the unanimous denigration of Shelley by the New Critics is perhaps the most striking example. Finally, and most important of all, this principle prevents the treatment of a poem as anything but an instance of universal poetry—of the abstract trait or quality, that is, by which it is distinguished from science. The New Critics, consequently, can offer for our delight only some gray abstraction, an example of Paradox, Irony, or Tension, more bloodless than a mathematical formula. It is a poor account, surely, of the poem in its beauty and power, as we know it in direct experience.

The second fact is the selection of language, a quality of style or a way of using words, as the essential characteristic of poetry, by which it may be defined in itself and distinguished from all nonpoetic things. For several reasons, the linguistic or semantic definition of poetry seems untenable to Crane and Olson.

In the first place, the proposition is unproved and probably unprovable. As I have suggested, the claim that poetic language is ambiguous or paradoxical is in truth a deduction from certain unexamined assumptions about knowledge and the mind. In the writings of Brooks and others of his school, this claim is supported only by a circular argument, from the interpretations which the proposition itself produces. When read on Empsonian assumptions, the poems analyzed by Brooks and Empson naturally turn out to be ambiguous. But under scholarly techniques of exegesis, the meanings which are alleged to introduce ironic qualifications would in most cases be rejected as historically impossible, not intended by the poet, and hence not actually present in the words at all, when correctly understood. And even if Empson's assumptions were accepted, it would certainly appear that prose writings, if analyzed in the same way, would reveal a similar clash of meanings—as has, in fact, been shown several times by I. A. Richards. The truth probably is that there is no quality or device of style, common to all poems, which cannot also be found in philosophical, scientific, or rhetorical writings. If so, it is not by style that poetry can or should be distinguished from nonpoetry.

Secondly, the semantic definition of poetry is inadequate. A complete account of anything requires a treatment of all its causes or determinants. But poetry has various causes, of which language is only one. An adequate theory would have to account not only for style, the material cause of poetry, but also for its formal, final, and efficient causes—for the structure imposed upon and realized in the verbal medium, for the effect of the artistic whole upon its audience, for the poet whose skill produces the aesthetic object. The New Critics are bankrupt, according to Crane, because they offer a monistic theory, reducing poetry to a single cause, instead of the multidimensional theory which is needed.

Finally, the cause chosen is the least essential, the vehicle or medium, the mere material instrument of poetry. From language, as the sole cause of poetry, the New Critics attempt to derive the form or structure of poems; intention and effect are rejected as "fallacious," because external to the work.¹² This reasoning is self-defeating, because it inverts the true order of causal relationships in a poem. Deriving the form of a poem from its linguistic medium, Olson says, is like arguing that the shape and function of a saw are determined by the steel of which it is made. The true relationship is the reverse of this; for, as the qualities of matter required in a good saw are determined by the desired shape and function,

¹² See W. K. Wimsatt, Jr. and M. C. Beardsley, "The Affective Fallacy," in Stallman, *Critiques and Essays*, pp. 401-411, and "The Intentional Fallacy," *Seewanee Review*, LIV (1946), 468-488.

not the other way round, so the qualities of style in a good poem are determined by the uses to which language is put by the poet—by the form or pattern to be realized and the effect to be attained.¹³ These qualities of style must, of course, be inherent as potentialities in the linguistic instrument; one could not make a saw of lead. But as steel can be molded to many shapes, answering various uses, so words are malleable by the poet, who chooses among the potentialities of words those which suit his aesthetic intention.

The attempt to define poetry in terms of language, Olson concludes, condemns the New Critics to treat "only a single part of poetry, and that part the least important one poetically." Or as Crane puts the same objection, this choice allows them to deal "only with one of the necessary, and never with any of the sufficient or distinguishing, conditions of poetic works."¹⁴ The reduction of literature to style, of poetics to semantics—which is not only monism, but materialistic monism at that—makes it impossible to treat poems fully, or to treat them as poems, since it precludes the analysis either of their formal properties or of their distinctive effects upon the reader. The New Criticism, in short, cannot keep its glowing promises; for the work of art, we are offered only the lifeless clay.

In the present situation, Brooks recognizes three possible alternatives: positivistic scholarship, appreciation without principles, or the New Criticism. His assessment of these possibilities, though sound in part, is not convincing. Whether positivistic or not, scholarship is necessary, in order to correct the distortions brought by time and to restore the work as it first came from the hand of the poet. It must be granted, however, that scholarship is not enough; it provides no instruments of aesthetic analysis or evaluation, and it should be supplemented and completed by a sound method of criticism. In the practice of criticism—and in scholarship itself, for that matter—sensitivity and taste will always be needed; as Henry James says, "the most improved criticism will not abolish that primitive, that ultimate test."¹⁵ Yet Brooks is right in attacking intuitionism; for, if appreciation is limited to subjective response, to mere taste uncontrolled by general principles, there can be no systematic study of literature—no teaching, no scholarship, and no rational criticism. The New Criticism, however, does not give us what we need. Its method of interpretation is unacceptable, giving us not the poem that the poet wrote but some construction of an alien dialectic, and its analytical and evaluative criteria are unsound and inadequate; it is not a great criticism, but a meager and sterile one. If these are the only alternatives, it seems to me, our best course would be to save scholarship and abandon all hope for an adequate criticism.

But Brooks' alternatives, fortunately, do not exhaust the possibilities in the present situation. In spite of their commitment to the New Criticism, these anthologies show that other choices, not mentioned by Brooks, are open to us—other types of criticism, less rigid and narrow than his, and more compatible with scholarship.

To me, at least, the most attractive of these is the neo-Aristotelian criticism which has been evolving at the University of Chicago; Stallman includes an

¹³ Olson, "William Empson," *loc. cit.*, p. 231. The impossibility of deriving the form of anything from the properties of its matter is also stated by Craig LaDrière, in a passage quoted by Stallman, *Critic's Notebook*, pp. 65-66. Though expressed in Aristotelian terms by Crane and Olson, the point should be obvious to common sense.

¹⁴ Olson, "William Empson," *loc. cit.*, p. 231, and Crane, "Cleanth Brooks," *loc. cit.*, p. 243.

¹⁵ "The Art of Fiction," in *Criticism*, p. 51.

example of it in Olson's "Outline of Poetic Theory."¹⁶ Like other writings by Olson and his colleagues, this is a thorny and difficult essay. One must confess, too, at this moment in history, that there is something artificial, something almost quixotic, in an attempt to found a living criticism on the method and principles of Aristotle. But these critics seem to offer what the New Critics promise without producing—a way of judging poems as poems, and by a method not partial but comprehensive, neither absolute nor relativistic, and fully compatible with scholarly standards of interpretation.

And there are other possibilities in contemporary criticism, broader and more flexible than the New Criticism, less academic than Chicago Aristotelianism—though at the same time less strictly aesthetic in their standards of judgment. Among these, Kenneth Burke and Lionel Trilling may be mentioned; both are represented in these anthologies. Though often grouped with the New Critics, Burke is quite different from the writers defended by Brooks. Psychological in his underlying assumptions, he treats a poem as an act of the poet, discovering form not in the nature of words but in the reaction of the audience. His interpretations are often questionable, on grammatical and historical grounds, but his method is multidimensional rather than monistic; he does much more justice both to the power and to the formal beauty of poetry than any of the New Critics. Trilling is less systematic, but his readings are scholarly, and, I think, more perceptive than Burke's. His standards are perhaps less aesthetic than social and moral, but he distinguishes clearly between the literary values and the psychological sources of poetry; and, though he is not untouched by semanticism and the ambiguity principle, his judgments are much more satisfactory, less narrow and doctrinaire, than those of Empson, Tate, or Brooks. Objections can be raised against both Burke and Trilling, but at least they do not reduce all literature to a single drab abstraction, and neither of them identifies poetics with linguistics.

And there is T. S. Eliot, a monumental figure, more impressive in the scope of his interests, in the excellence of his taste and the grace of his style, than any critic of our time. His theory of poetry is open to serious objections,¹⁷ and his judgments—as in the famous case of Milton—are sometimes distorted by his avowed subordination of universal standards to the changing needs of contemporary poetic practice. But criticism, as he conceives it, is not mere paradox chopping, and he does not, like Richards, attack scholarship as benighted and worthless, a presemantic superstition. Whatever its limitations, Eliot's criticism is much to be preferred to that which Brooks defends.

The New Criticism, to give the movement its due, has done literature a great and much needed service. By forcing scholars to concede that scholarship is not enough, it has enriched and enlivened the study and teaching of literature; as any recent issue of *PMLA* will show, it has opened the way for new and valuable developments within scholarship itself. But as a pattern for sound criticism, as a positive program of literary interpretation and appreciation, the New Criticism

¹⁶ See also the last section of Olson's essay on Empson, cited above, and R. S. Crane, "The Plot of 'Tom Jones,'" *Journal of General Education*, IV (1950), 112-130. The theoretical foundations of this mode of criticism are presented in two valuable, but not easily digestible, papers by Richard McKeon, "The Philosophic Bases of Art and Criticism," *Modern Philology*, XLI (1943-44), 65-87 and 129-171. M. E. Prior's very interesting and original book, *The Language of Tragedy* (New York, 1947), is based upon similar premises, less technically stated; it was not very well understood by most of its reviewers.

¹⁷ Some of these are discussed by Eliseo Vivas, "The Objective Correlative of T. S. Eliot," in Stallman, *Critiques and Essays*, pp. 389-400.

is a cul-de-sac, a false turning which leads not to the open country but to a blank wall and a dead end. The future of criticism, I am sure, lies in a different direction.

HOYT TROWBRIDGE

University of Oregon

DIZIONARIO LETTERARIO BOMPIANI DELLE OPERE E DEI PERSONAGGI DI TUTTI I TEMPI E DI TUTTE LE LETTERATURE. Milano: Valentino Bompiani, 1947-1950. 9 vols. 835, 876, 779, 855, 890, 916, 935, 880, 370 p.

This new Italian literary dictionary in nine large volumes (in small print and double columns) is by far the fullest and best literary encyclopaedia ever produced in any language. Volumes one to seven contain a description of almost every conceivable book of all literatures and all times, arranged alphabetically according to the Italian title; the first half of the first volume (344 pages) provides long essays on the main intellectual and literary movements (e.g., romanticism, classicism, stoicism, empiricism, etc.); the whole of the eighth volume is devoted to a dictionary of characters in books and plays; the ninth volume contains a chronological table of all literature and very full indices—an index of titles in the original language (indispensable to the non-Italian user who could not possibly guess that, for instance, *The Spoils of Poynton* must be found under *Fine di Poynton* or that the *Double Dealer* is called *Falso Amico* in Italian), an index of authors, and an index of the illustrations. The illustrations include many hundreds of full-page plates (frequently colored) and thousands of small illustrations. These provide a very full compendium of art history, illustrations to books, reproductions of title pages, portraits of authors, and so on.

It is almost impossible to give a description of the scope of the volumes except by saying that they contain a whole library of information on almost everything. As the text runs to 7,000 pages and a full page seems to contain as many as 1,200 words, the number of words, even allowing for the illustrations in the text, must be well over 7,000,000. Literature is not understood as limited to imaginative literature, but includes all books of philosophy, history, the sciences, mathematics, etc. which have had any reputation in the past. The *Dictionary* also includes works of music; all operas of any renown are described and hundreds of symphonies, sonatas, and songs, with examples of motifs from the scores. Sometimes individual poems even of small scale have independent listing (e.g., Shelley's "To Jane" and Poe's "To Helen"), and long and complex works are described on many pages in great detail. Frequently an attempt is made to list all other versions of the same theme (e.g., of the Wandering Jew, Cleopatra, or the Devil), thus providing a very full *Stoffgeschichte* of particular interest to students of comparative literature. A list of quotations from prominent critics who have pronounced upon the work under discussion is included in many of the articles.

The huge enterprise is not merely a compilation undertaken (as so many encyclopaedias are) by hack writers drawing from secondary sources. The *Dictionary* was directed by the most outstanding Italian literary scholars; e.g., Italian literature was supervised by Francesco Flora and Attilio Momigliano, English literature by Mario Praz, Russian and Czech literature by Ettore Lo Gatto. The list of some 500 contributors contains almost every living Italian scholar and a sprinkling of foreigners (such as Karl Vossler, Jean Hankiss, Angel Valbuena Prat). Thus the quality of the contributions is generally of a

very high order. The articles range in content from accurate statements of fact, firsthand descriptions, and summaries to fine critical essays, elaborate characterizations, and evaluations. The section "Movimenti Spirituali" in the first volume, in particular, contains distinguished essays, well-informed and well-phrased (e.g., Antonio Viscardi's on "Classicismo"); and throughout the volumes there are contributions which go far beyond what one would expect even of the most excellent encyclopaedia. I have read with great profit and admiration the essays by Mario Praz on every play and all the main characters of Shakespeare, the items on the novels of Dostoevsky and Tolstoy, and the very full pieces on the German romantics. An individual cannot properly review a whole library; but in using the volumes constantly, some for almost four years, I have found the standard of accuracy uniformly high, the completeness of the listing extraordinary, and the value of the critical comments comparable to the best criticism anywhere.

In a work of such scope and variety of authorship it is, of course, possible to find lacunae and certain disproportions, and even errors of fact and judgment. But I would give a totally false impression if I should emphasize the failings I have noticed. I call attention to them only in the hope of a second edition which might repair deficiencies which are quite minor compared to the bulk of the work.

An American reader will be satisfied by the number of articles on all major writings of American literature from Michael Wigglesworth down to E. A. Robinson and Theodore Dreiser. But American literature stops there: neither Sinclair Lewis (though "Babbitt" appears in the eighth volume among characters), nor Faulkner, nor Hemingway, nor Steinbeck, nor even T. S. Eliot is represented. The articles in the eighth volume which give strangely solemn accounts of Dagwood and Blondie, Popeye, Mickey Mouse, and Superman seem small recompense for these omissions. If we examine the coverage of recent French literature, we miss also many prominent names, e.g., Roger Martin du Gard, François Mauriac, André Malraux. Soviet literature, while not entirely ignored, is surely underrepresented; not even Yesenin, Pasternak, or Sholokhov can be found. And, among names of recent authors of other nations, I miss those of Sigrid Undset and Hermann Hesse, to keep only to recipients of the Nobel Prize. Among "movimenti spirituali" I miss an account of "realism."

If we examine the treatment of one smaller literature (Czech and Slovak), we must be surprised by the number of items accurately described by Professor Lo Gatto; even little known Slovak novelists are represented. But, on the other hand, some of the greatest names in Czech intellectual and literary history are totally ignored: Hus, Palacký, Masaryk, to mention only those known outside of Czechoslovakia. Among the authors selected, the choice of works seems frequently quite haphazard. Karel Capek is represented by three books, but neither his trilogy of novels (his best work) nor his best-known drama (*The Insect Play*) is listed. But where so much is offered it seems ungrateful to ask for more.

Occasionally disproportions, though inevitable, seem glaring; e.g., there is only a short note on Wordsworth's *Prelude*, while Werfel's *Song of Bernadette* is twice described in great detail, and most enthusiastically (V, 576-7, VIII, 115). At times the account of a well-known book is vague and even inaccurate (as that of Balzac's *La Peau de Chagrin*, V, 456); at times an Italian adaptation must have been relied upon rather than the original (as when Lord B. in Richardson's *Pamela* is given the impossible name of Lord Belfart, V, 363); and at times the enthusiasm of a contributor seems to run away with him (as when

Eça de Queiros is declared "one of the greatest [novelists] of all literature," IV, 41). The cheap and silly article on "Circe," with allusions to Greta Garbo, cocktails, etc., appears an isolated lapse (VIII, 177). Many such observations could be made and constant use may unearth more defects. But constant use is the compliment which we should pay a work of such magnitude and distinction, which clearly belongs in every university and college library and wherever Italian is read at all.

There is only one serious complaint which diminishes the enjoyment of this mine of information; the print is far too small (nonpareil, 6 point, which causes eye-strain). Even an enlargement by one point would help greatly and enlargement would also benefit many of the smaller pictures which now can only serve as reminders of what might be there. These small pictures are not fully effective beside the superb full-page reproductions which alone would make a comparable work in this country prohibitively expensive. Let us hope that the *Dizionario Bompiani* will soon have a second edition, in larger type.

R.W.

THE OTHER WORLD, ACCORDING TO DESCRIPTIONS IN MEDIEVAL LITERATURE. By Howard Rollin Patch. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950. ix, 386 p.

Professor Patch tells us in the preface to his erudite volume that, when he had entered on his investigation of the Other World in mediaeval literature, "It soon became apparent that no one could complete such a task alone. Only what might be called the prolegomena for the work might be presented with suggestions for method and some indication of the extent of the material." In all fairness, the truth which occasioned this apology must be granted, but even so the book remains in many ways a disappointing one. The student browsing through its pages cannot but wish frequently (and timidly, to be sure, in the face of such ponderous and precise learning) that some of the documentation had been omitted to make room for more critical evaluation.

The organization of the book, although there are some evident reasons for it, is itself a partial hindrance to the realization of certain values in the kind of study Professor Patch is attempting. His first three chapters are a summary consideration of sources by rough geographical divisions: Oriental and Classical, Celtic, and Germanic. The author has, and perhaps wisely, avoided any consideration of possible cultural or psychological factors in the origin of such a myth, but has chosen rather to examine in some detail the early sources of a small group of ideas which he considers characteristic of the whole tradition. From accounts in Vedic myth, the Old Testament writings, etc., he extracts such common features as the journey into the skies; the voyage across strange seas, sometimes to Fortunate Isles; the menacing river barrier, which is sometimes of a punitive or purgatorial nature and may be spanned by a bridge which is a form of test for the crossing souls; the holy mountain, atop or inside of which is located the blessed land; the garden with the tree bearing the fruit of life, the sacred rivers, and perhaps even celestial maidens for the entertainment of the elect. After tracing these features through Greek and Latin, Celtic, and Germanic tradition, Professor Patch abandons this system of national or tribal division, and in his fourth chapter gives simple summaries of the principal mediaeval vision stories, arranged in chronological order. And this arrangement is in turn abandoned in the final chapters in favor of a division by genres.

The unfortunate result of these methodological vagaries is that significant pat-

terns and connections frequently fail to emerge from the mass of documentation. The possibility of interpretation in terms of national literary traditions is obviated early in the study; and, of course, one must accept the author's explanation that such national divisions were adopted in the first place only for convenience in establishing a mythological background. Yet the chapter on the Celtic tradition, for example, offers a wealth of material for some interesting observations, both in regard to parallels with the Classical tradition and concerning its highly imaginative individual development. Such commentary, when Professor Patch ventures any at all, is usually of the most general and cursory nature:

"There are many points of similarity between the classical ideas of the other world and those of the Celts. Here too we find the Isles of the Blessed to be reached by a long voyage, the holy mountain, and a lower world. But all these are marked with strong differences from the equivalents in Greek and Roman mythology, and show with intensity that play of the Celtic fantasy which gives their accounts highly individualized characteristics" (p. 27).

Given a specific group of points of contact, or threads of continuity, between developing literary traditions, the investigator must consider more than the mere fact of the recurrence of whatever specific details provide him with a focus of comparison. These very characteristic details, as Professor Patch himself is well aware, have one artistic value in the context of one literature or one work of art, and quite a different value in another literature or work. It is these contextual variations in artistic significance which the comparative study of literary themes and traditions should help to clarify; yet what follows the statement quoted above from the opening paragraph of the chapter on "Otherworld Themes among the Celts" is in effect simply a rather copiously annotated bibliography of Welsh and Irish documents wherein such themes may be discovered.

In a way, however, this criticism is not strictly fair to the work under consideration, for it becomes apparent after Chapter III that the intention is not to make a comparative study. Chapter IV, "The Literature of Visions," begins a systematic series of summaries of the principal visions of the other world, from Plutarch through the satiric vision in *Pantagruel*. In this chapter, however, we are handicapped in obtaining a broad view of the developmental continuity of the otherworld tradition by Professor Patch's decision to leave all the material from the allegories and romances for the two final chapters. With these lacking, as well as the class of narrative labeled in the following chapter "Journeys to Paradise," what remains to the visions proper is not so much a sense of historical continuity as of necessarily monotonous repetition.

In the light of the extensive documentation offered in this study, it is evident that certain major themes were passed from hand to hand, becoming somewhat shopworn in the process, and finally came to rest in a great variety of surroundings. And this fact alone no doubt has its significance. The question remains, however: What do they do to the surroundings into which they are brought? And, conversely, what has the artist in the particular case done with them? What effect does a particular treatment have upon the course of the tradition? It is true that a considerable amount of scholarship has accumulated already concerning several of the specific themes considered. It is to be regretted, however, that in a survey of this nature so little summary of the results of this scholarship has been included by way of connective tissue to bind the bare bones. But it should be remarked that the author has incorporated at the end of his study an excellent 42-page bibliography of primary and secondary sources and of useable translations of the more esoteric material, as well.

In the final chapters of the book, Professor Patch leaves the chronological de-

velopment more or less behind him and splits his material into three main literary types: journeys to Paradise, allegory, and romance. Aside from the fact that these may not all be distinctive categories on an equal basis (for example, in which should the *Divine Comedy* be placed, in which the *House of Fame*?), there are other difficulties in these divisions. If romantic and allegorical treatments of the otherworld themes are to be considered, why not lyric or satiric or didactic ones as well? For these too, as the collected documents show, form an important part of the tradition. More serious, perhaps, is the fact that Professor Patch does not make any real distinctions, in terms of the traditions he is pursuing, between the literary types he does use for purposes of classification. There are obviously differences in the nature and functions of the otherworld themes in the *Romance of the Rose*, Chrétien's *Lancelot*, the *Divine Comedy*, and *Mandeville's Travels*; but, in the volume under consideration, apparently only the fact of the recurrence of the themes (and possible parallel sources) is considered noteworthy.

As Professor Patch seems to suggest in the conclusion to his study, a kind of general cyclical pattern may be observed in the various lines of development of the tradition. One can only wish that more attention had been given in the course of the study to the clarification of this progressive sophistication which gradually turned a religious myth into a literary convention of varied symbolic values. This pattern of development, including the satiric deterioration in the later stages, is already discernible in the Classical treatments of the themes in question, and is repeated on a much larger scale in the Middle Ages. The distinctive feature of the mediaeval development is the much greater exploitation of the allegorical possibilities, most interestingly, perhaps, as they become involved in the conventions of courtly love. It requires a good deal of shuffling from section to section, however, for the reader to keep in view the outlines and the general sequence of these developments in the otherworld tradition.

To conclude this series of scattered criticisms with the acknowledgement of a real debt, it is obvious that even such observations as I have made depend on the availability of a large body of material in a convenient source. It would be a most ungrateful omission not to recognize the assiduous scholarship which has gone into Professor Patch's volume. It also would seem an all but superhuman task for a single study to answer all the questions which naturally arise in connection with such a vast, complex, and significant body of material. Still, a more clearly defined approach or principle of organization might have made the book a more useful and revealing one for the student of mediaeval literature.

ROBERT O. PAYNE

University of Cincinnati

PERSPECTIVES OF CRITICISM. Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature XX.

Edited by Harry Levin. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950. xiv, 248 p.

The volume contains the following essays: Jean Seznec, "Paul Claudel and the Sarcophagus of the Muses"; William C. Greene, "The Greek Criticism of Poetry: A Reconsideration"; Harry Levin, "Notes on Convention"; Alfred Schwartz, "Otto Ludwig's Shakespearean Criticism"; Perry Miller, "Edwards, Locke, and the Rhetoric of Sensation"; Walter Jackson Bate, "Coleridge and the Function of Art"; Geoffrey Tillotson, "Newman's Essay on Poetry: An Exposition and Comment"; John V. Kelleher, "Matthew Arnold and the Celtic Revival"; Renato Poggioli, "A Correspondence from Opposite Corners."

The book is perhaps not so exciting as the title and the gray-on-chartreuse dust jacket manage to intimate; the prevailing philological sobriety is more faithfully represented by the half title. Nevertheless the word "Perspectives" is well chosen, and for two notable reasons: the wide span of critical history commanded from the positions occupied by the nine essays, and a certain stereoscopic structure which appears in nearly all the essays, a vertical conjunction of critics and critics, critics and poets. The editor protests that the volume "is rather a miscellany than a symposium." "Its contributors," he says, "were not asked to frame their articles within a prearranged scheme." But to a large extent they have, happily, done so.

The first essay, though its entrance into the realm of ideas is through one of Claudel's odes on "The Muses," looks into a more remote vista, the inspirational part of ancient poetics—an area which, in modern times, is more often described in merely psychological terms, but which is illumined with a generous aura of its original supernaturalism by Claudel and by other French Catholic writers of the same generation, Péguy, for instance, or Bremond. The quotations from Philo and Proclus at the end of Mr. Seznec's essay, asserting the literal Platonic connection between inspired wisdom and "astral" immortality, not only clarify the role of the Muses on the sarcophagus in the Louvre but deepen a literary theory which, though it may never have shown us much about criticism, remains a perennial witness to the mystery of literature and its ultimate refusal to submit to science. The second essay in the volume, that of Mr. Greene, continues the Classical theme, surveying Greek critical ideas from Homer and Hesiod to Longinus, but chiefly those of Plato and Aristotle. Though this essay is one of a few in the volume which employ a relatively flat technique of direct summation, a certain perspective results from the traverse of the centuries and the frequent appeal to Greek poetry. Comparing this with the corresponding chapters in J. W. H. Atkins' *Literary Criticism in Antiquity*, one might say that Atkins presents a more complete catalogue of topics (as also does Mr. Greene's much earlier long essay on Plato in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* for 1918), but that the present essay has the virtue of greater integration and economy. It is a conveniently essential tabloid, at all points handsomely informed.

The fourth to the eighth essays in the volume make a second complementary series, this time of dramatic incidents in the great classic-to-romantic process which constitutes modern critical history. I wonder at the placing of the fourth, by Mr. Schwarz, on "Otto Ludwig's Shakespearean Criticism," for here the chief revelation is not about Shakespeare but about the less well-known nineteenth-century *Shakespeare-Studien*, Ludwig's "dramaturgical diary." The interest is not in Hamlet and Lear as "temperamental" men, Macbeth and Othello as "passionate" men, but in a classico-romantic theory of character drama, an "ideal nexus" or inner unity of "tragic passion" (Lessing and Schlegel or Coleridge joined), and in the fact that Shakespeare stood as the unassailable exemplar.

The next essay, Mr. Miller's on the relation between John Locke and Jonathan Edwards, could not have been better chosen, or better placed, to illustrate what happened to the theory of imagination in that dark era of the first scientific triumph. (An essay on the Viconian dawn put just beside this would have been a nice complication of the perspective.) It appears to me that, towards the end of the essay, one has to do some stretching to read anything very Lockean in Edwards' leap from the sensational impact of the word to the saving idea infused by the Spirit of God. But not so for the most obvious feature of Edwards' style and theory, illustrated so forcefully by a passage from the hellfire

sermon. Edwards' sledge-hammer apparatus for driving home simple sensory ideas was the logical outcome and application of the Lockean epistemology and semantics. And this implies a great deal too about such genteel and literary theorists as Addison on the pleasures of the imagination, Burke, or Kames. The importance of Mr. Miller's thesis lies not mainly in the fact that it can be illustrated biographically for Edwards from his notebooks in the Yale Library (though the illustration is apt and entertaining) but in that it goes to the heart of a certain rhetorical conception.

The sixth essay, by Mr. Bate, surveys the Coleridgean materials on the "Function of Art," with delicate adjustments all along the line, a patient nudging of each phrase of evidence toward the conclusion that Coleridge at least entertained a "hope" for a metaphysically based and elaborately consistent synthesis of classical rationalism and romantic vitalism. "The heart should have fed upon the truth as insects on a leaf, till it be tinged with the colour." This essay (like Mr. Greene's on the Greeks) employs the relatively direct approach—though with a profusion of document (characteristic of Mr. Bate's writing in this field) which makes its own kind of depth—not for casual wading. We may well go to school to Mr. Bate and be admonished that there is more to read than perhaps we usually do. I suspect, however, that he underrates the debt to the German philosophers. One might distinguish between a general epistemological debt to Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* and a more specific aesthetic debt to the *Critique of Judgment*. The latter, so apparent in Coleridge's essays on "Genial Criticism" and on "Taste," is for some reason not mentioned. It appears to me that the technique has the more inherent faults of a certain remoteness from literary issues and, complementary to that, a more finicky way of dealing with the metaphysics and psychology than perhaps they will bear. I wonder, for example, whether it is necessary either to depress or to reinterpret the famous passage in *Biographia* XIII on "primary" and "secondary" imagination. Coleridge said other things in other places. But it is difficult to see how the view of these two grades of imagination defined by Shawcross (as something elaborated out of Kant through Schelling—the powers which give us respectively the world of ordinary things and the more deeply significant landscapes of *Tintern Abbey* and *The Ancient Mariner*) is either clarified or made more relevant to the general drift of the *Biographia* by the following (p. 146):

"... 'primary' imagination may simply refer to that aspect of the creative capacity which draws down the rational insight of the universal into an individualized form of response, thus repeating the 'eternal act of creation' whereby value becomes fulfilled in concrete particularity. Similarly, the 'secondary' imagination would apply to the same creative and energizing power as it is directed to the world of material phenomena—of 'objects,' which, as they appear to sense and the understanding, are 'essentially fixed and dead'; and these objects it 'struggles to idealize and unify.'"

Behind the many and variously inspired utterances of a prolific poet-thinker, it is surely not always profitable to suppose that we shall discover the completely consistent and adequate philosopher. Apparently Mr. Tillotson would agree. In the seventh essay of the volume he shows no reluctance, at any rate, to observe the youthful Newman dividing an essay on Aristotle's *Poetics* between a main body of odds and ends and an opening and a close which criticize the classic doctrine of the great and coherent action by a standard of evangelical lyricism. The topic was a happily novel selection for this place in the series, the focus (as with the essay on Ludwig) being clearly not on the earlier writer but on his

nineteenth-century interpreter. "When he praises Virgil and Milton," says Mr. Tillotson, "he forgets that he never saw their eyes glittering with inspiration, but can only infer their glitter from the printed page..." Mr. Tillotson's concern to expose this vein of expressionism and inspirationalism suggests a fairly close sympathy with the *Sewanee* school of objective criticism.

Among the essays so far named I put first in narrative value that of Mr. Seznec on Claudel and that of Mr. Miller on Locke and Edwards. Even more dramatically, because more economically, turned, however, is the eighth essay, Mr. Kelleher's, concerning Arnold's lectures on *Celtic Literature* and the spirit conjured up several decades later by Yeats and other originators of the Celtic revival. Mr. Kelleher's compact and clean style is well illustrated in the following key passage (p. 207):

"...*Ossian* reflects, through Macpherson's mind, the atmosphere of melancholy and defeat that pervaded the Scotch Highlands after 1745. We have then a reasonably clear recurrence of a similar emotional tone, first in Scotland in the mid-eighteenth century, thereafter in Macpherson, then in that part of Arnold's temperament which senses the world as

a darkling plain
Swept with confused alarms of struggle and flight
Where ignorant armies clash by night,

and at last in the general feeling of disheartenment in Ireland after Parnell. And at no point in the series is real Celtic literature brought in for the primary effect."

The last essay in the volume, that of Mr. Poggioli, is also notable for its narrative part, a richly perspective account of the careers of Ivanov and Herschensohn and of the heavily charged correspondence which went across the diagonal of that room in the Moscow sanatorium where the two champions were resting in the summer of 1920. But Mr. Poggioli's *Partisan* appraisal (see Preface, p. xiv), his rejection of both the "horizontal" humanitarianism of Herschensohn and the "vertical" traditionalism of Ivanov, seems to me a conclusion irrelevant to the area of literary theory occupied by the whole volume and one that suffers, furthermore, from the disadvantage of leaving Mr. Poggioli himself remarkably little ground to stand on.

The third essay in the volume, Mr. Levin's "Notes on Convention," has not been mentioned so far because it differs from all the others in that it does not linger on any single figure or perspectively related pair but surveys a central critical concept in complicated evolution. (Mr. Levin's style too is different from all the others. The densely serried examples, the continually concrete ingenuities, must provoke admiration, even though they leave at the same time a desire for more frequent lapses into discursive and summary modes.) "Convention," if one may hazard a selection, is something which got along well in the artfulness of neoclassicism without being known as such or named. It was detected and defined by preromantic French critics, soon after repudiated in the full swing of romanticism, and then redefined and accepted as something related to dramatic illusion. Definitions of it have ranged between the extremes of "limit" and "license." It is something which the manipulation of the literary medium cannot avoid. "It traces its origin to imperfection—not to the fault of the craftsman, but to the limitation of the craft. Since art never imitates nature quite perfectly, there must be a margin of error: an allowance for unnaturalness, a residue of artificiality... it has two related and recognizable phases: it stereotypes life and it humanizes technique... every convention, however formalized, occupies a plane

where the discrepancies between matter and manner can be circumvented" (p. 60). Or, if Mr. Levin has to take a very fast shot, as he does in his Preface to the volume, he will say that convention is "a mean between art and nature." His essay is both a relentless historical pursuit of its protean theme and a shrewd contribution to philosophy of criticism.

W. K. WIMSATT, JR.

Yale University

DANTE'S FAME ABROAD, 1350-1850. THE INFLUENCE OF DANTE ALIGHIERI ON THE POETS AND SCHOLARS OF SPAIN, FRANCE, ENGLAND, GERMANY, SWITZERLAND AND THE UNITED STATES. A SURVEY OF THE PRESENT STATE OF SCHOLARSHIP. By Werner P. Friederich. University of North Carolina Studies in Comparative Literature. Chapel Hill, 1950. 583 p.

As complicated as the title of this book would be a just review of a necessarily hybrid work which hovers between a critical reader on Dante scholarship outside Italy and a reference book for Dante translations, non-Italian poetry influenced by Dante, and Dante criticism. To start with the author, one may truly say that no one was better prepared than the widely read and circumspect Professor Friederich to do this difficult job. He not only contributed the Dante items to his and Professor Baldensperger's well-known *Bibliography of Comparative Literature* (pp. 408-418), but also made preliminary studies for the present work in his articles: "Dante through the Centuries," *CL*, I (1949); "Dante's Fame among the Poets and Philosophers of Germany, 1800-1865," *PQ*, XXV (1946); "The Unsolved Problem of Dante's Influence in Spain," *HR*, XIV (1946); and "Switzerland's Contribution to the International Appreciation of Dante Alighieri," *SP*, XLII (1945).

Always with acumen in the selections and taste in their evaluation, Professor Friederich draws upon the surveys by Casella for Catalonia; Farinelli and Ford for Spain; Counson, Hauvette, and Oelsner for France; Toynbee, Galimberti, and Kuhns for England; Grauert, M. Koch, and Ostermann for Germany. The important study of Angelina La Piana, *Dante's American Pilgrimage* (1948) was not used, since Professor Friederich's manuscript was finished when this work appeared. Friederich's American chapter, built on Boni, Grandgent, and T. Koch, is therefore largely superseded by the recent publication on this subject.

The author's first idea seems to have been "adding some flesh to the skeleton" (see p. 444) of Marco Besso's book, *La fortuna di Dante fuori d'Italia* (1912). But in so doing he abandoned one of Besso's principles, namely to quote always the same passage from all the translators, prose and poetry, *terza rima*, blank verse, Spenserian stanzas, heroic couplets, alexandrines, and so on. Friederich varies his selections, and thus deprives the reader of a historical sketch of the variations on a specific theme from Dante in various centuries and languages. Friederich's range of translated selections is wide. He quotes from the *Vita Nuova*, from the sonnets, from the *Monarchia*; as far as the *Divine Comedy* is concerned, he shows preference for the Francesca and Ugolino episodes, branching out to the Francesca novels and Ugolino dramas developed from the respective passages in Dante.

It is doubtful whether in such an attempt as is made here a *mise au point* is possible. Friederich is fascinated by the concept of "scholarship" and "findings." But if "scholars" who want to be literary historians rather than comparatists of texts merely give their impressions on Dante "influences," it is

meaningless to state that one "believes" there is influence, and another that there is none. All these older "comparatists" ignored the fundamental principle that to cite one possible source among many others is arbitrary. What counts is one essential source in its uniqueness. This principle has been definitely brought home by María Rosa Lida in her recent masterly study of *Juan de Mena* (1950); she practically proves the influence of Dante on fourteenth-century Spain to be nonexistent, since even the famous quotation "Nessun maggior dolore..." (occurring a dozen times in Friederich) is not necessarily to be traced directly to Dante, and may have been a kind of proverbial quotation for Dante himself.

Thus the strongest chapters on true Dantean influence are those indicating where Dante's *spirit* is absorbed, together with more or less formal influences. Such influences are obvious for Chaucer ("Rhedeth the grete poete of Ytaille that highte Dant, for he can al devyse"), Shelley ("complete saturation with the great Florentine"), perhaps Milton ("not always conscious of the debt")—but not at all for Goethe, despite the many insipid comparisons of the *Divine Comedy* with *Faust*. This result is not astonishing. Those who used Dante in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the Catalans and Spaniards, were seeking *endecasillabo* and *terza rima* patterns—their visionary frames were satisfied by other and lower sources; Frenchmen, Englishmen, and Germans of the sixteenth century tried to find in Dante a champion for the Reformation or the Counter-Reformation, respectively. The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were hindered by narrowness or "enlightenment" from appreciating Dante's grandeur at all. Only romanticism discovers Dante "abroad," i.e., mainly in Germany. But even here, most of the poets play a lamentable role. Goethe judged "die Hölle ganz abscheulich, das Fegefeuer zweideutig und das Paradies langweilig" (p. 448):

"Nach drüben ist die Aussicht uns verrannt...
Thor! Wer dorthin die Augen blinzeln richtet,
Sich über Wolken Seinesgleichen dichtet" (p. 457).

It is a real merit of Professor Friederich to have bared this negative aspect which will help to remove all illusions about earlier enthusiasm for Dante and even general knowledge of his work beyond the *Inferno*. But what is most inspiring is the history of the slowly growing Dante criticism on an empathic and philological basis in the first half of the nineteenth century to its culmination in Karl Witte. The small print of Friederich's long notes contains a precious critical anthology. A chronological table furnishes ready information about the main events in the history of Dante criticism, influence, and translation.

The influence of Dante on the arts of design and music from Michelangelo to Franz Liszt and Richard Wagner is also considered in this book. El Greco should have been included here. His "Paradiso" in the *Burial of Count Orgas* and his *last Assumption* (cf. *Par.* XXIII, 79-139) are definitely Dantesque, more Dantesque than any other influence of the Italian poet on Spanish literature or art.

Even Dantologists, I suppose, will learn curious details from *Dante's Fame Abroad*, e.g., that Cardinal Bellarmine, in 1592, was the first correct interpreter of *Purg.* XXXIII, 36 (not 34!): "Che vendetta di Dio non teme suppe"; that the famous dictionary of Moréri (1674) has this note on Dante: "Ses emportements contre le Saint Siège l'ont fait mettre au nombre des Auteurs censurez. A cela près, il avoit beaucoup de génie"; but Voltaire's *Dictionnaire philosophique* (1764) asserts: "Sa réputation s'affirmera toujours, parce qu'on ne le lit

guère"; that Louis XVI before his execution read Grangier's translation of the *Paradiso*; that F. Fertiault (1848) translated "Tanto gentile e tanto onesta pare..." by "Ma Dame paraît si noble et si bienséante" (!); that the comparison of the emaciated face to an inscribed *omo* (*Purg.* XXIII, 32) is repeated by Sir Thomas Browne in his *Hydriotaphia* (1658); that Thomas Gray avows that "The curfew tolls the knell of parting day" is a direct imitation of *Purg.* VIII, 5, but that Byron is silent about his much closer imitation in *Don Juan*, III, 108; that Cardinal Newman, according to Plumtre, has a spiritual affinity with Dante without being acquainted with his works; that the whole modern concept of the *Divina Commedia* is already condensed in Witte's essay *Über Dante* (1831); and that Carl Gustav Carus (1832) wrote a fine "wechselseitige Erhellung" on the fleeting voices in *Purg.* XIII, 25 ff. and Beethoven's *Mass in C Minor*.

Professor Friederich has not spared time and labor to provide us with the best and decisive extracts from innumerable books and studies concerned with Dante appreciation. With restraint and sound criticism, he has opened the way for novel and detailed studies. He deserves the deep gratitude of all his colleagues and fellow workers, who will regret, however, the absence of more detailed indices.

H.H.

CHARLES DU BOS AND ENGLISH LITERATURE. By Angelo Philip Bertocci. New York: Columbia University, 1949. 285 p.

Le 5 août 1939, alors que la France inquiète s'apprêtait à la guerre, Charles du Bos "fermait à la lumière de la terre ses admirables yeux de saphir et d'eau profonde et les ouvrait sur cette autre lumière qu'il avait tant désirée... De cette Europe véritable, qui fut jadis celle des grands esprits, de cette Europe harmonieuse que la force n'avait pas encore transformée en champ clos des pires combats, un témoin privilégié venait de se taire" (Daniel-Rops). Témoin privilégié, mais qui, même aujourd'hui, n'a pas la place qui devrait être la sienne. Reconnu par nombre de nos plus grands écrivains et philosophes, Gide, Claudel, Maritain, du Bos était ignoré du grand public. Son œuvre était qualifiée de "travail pour happy few" dans un feuillet littéraire d'Emile Henriot (*Le Monde*, 20 novembre 1946).

L'ouvrage du Professeur Angelo Philip Bertocci comble heureusement un vide regrettable. Dans un livre compact, fort bien conçu et composé, l'auteur nous fait sentir l'originalité de la critique de Charles du Bos. Entre la critique "dilettante" d'un Thibaudet et la critique "jugement" d'un Henri Massis, celle de du Bos apparaît comme une critique de compréhension. Bertocci cite un passage essentiel qui définit parfaitement l'attitude de l'auteur d'*Approximations*. "Interpréter l'œuvre d'un artiste... c'est encore descendre chez l'artiste jusqu'à cette vie végétative qui circule à son insu à travers tout ce qu'il fait, surprendre la formation et la montée de ses vapeurs... L'interprète véritable... il faut dans une certaine mesure qu'il décrive, non pas exactement l'œuvre qu'il a sous les yeux, mais l'état spirituel que celle-ci engendre chez le spectateur" (pp. 45-46). La critique devient une sorte d'*expérience intime*; elle cherche à partir des formes extérieures pour pénétrer l'âme, l'esprit qui les animent. Une telle critique exige un gros effort d'attention, tel qu'il y a une sorte de communion entre le lecteur et l'auteur. On a l'impression d'assister à une double création: le lecteur recrée l'auteur, l'auteur crée un lecteur nouveau.

Ce n'est pas le moindre mérite de Bertocci d'avoir choisi la méthode de du Bos lui-même pour étudier le critique. C'est à une introspection de l'âme de Charles du Bos que nous invitent les quatre premiers chapitres. Chapitres excellents, contribution essentielle aux études sur Charles du Bos. Peut-on exprimer le vœu que ces pages soient revues au fur et à mesure que paraîtront les nouveaux tomes du *Journal*. Le tome IV vient d'être publié.¹ Quelques passages de ce volume trouveraient aisément place dans l'introduction de Bertocci. En août 1928 du Bos analyse ses sentiments à la sortie de la messe (pp. 160-161). On est frappé par la similitude qui existe entre "l'amoureux de l'art" et le croyant. L'attitude de celui-ci devant la prière explique l'attitude de celui-là en présence de l'œuvre d'art.

Qu'il soit à l'église ou qu'il essaie de sonder l'âme du chef-d'œuvre, Charles du Bos a toujours le sentiment de "ce suspens du temps, et de son accession, malgré la contradiction des termes, à un intemporel momentané" (*Journal*, IV, 160). Remarque qui rejoint celle de Bertocci: "At any rate the aesthetic vision involves 'une sortie hors du temps, un transfert dans l'intemporel pur.'" Mais comment s'opèrent cette transformation de l'âme, cette fusion avec l'intemporel? Charles du Bos l'explique très bien dans le *Journal*. Il cite Camille Mauclair disant que toute audition musicale "devrait commencer par un prélude et une fugue de Bach qui sont le *vacuum cleaner* du lieu et des êtres" (p. 160), ce qui revient à dire qu'il faut d'abord se mettre en état de grâce. Il faut suivre attentivement les paroles du prêtre (ou la pensée de l'écrivain), redire avec lui les paroles pour "nettoyer l'espace intérieur." A ce dépouillement de l'âme succède l'effort d'attention "pour ne pas vaguer, butiner, pour ne pas donner accueil à ces mille riens absurdes, à ces mouches psychologiques ou pseudo-psychologiques qui courent sans relâche, en je ne sais quels futils zig-zags éperdus, sur la vitre de notre âme" (p. 161). Cet effort d'attention tendu vers une sorte d'extase mystique ressemble à la "tension" (Bertocci, chap. II, "A creature of Tension"), à la patience infinie qui lui permettaient de communier avec l'œuvre. Notons que dans son incertitude d'avoir fait plus qu'aborder le chef-d'œuvre Charles du Bos appelait ses essais critiques "approximations," ce que Bertocci remarque fort justement (p. 59).

Le professeur Bertocci a raison de montrer les dangers d'une telle méthode critique. Le critique est à un tel point absorbé par l'œuvre qu'il hésite à interpréter; il multiplie les citations et finit par disparaître totalement. Bertocci voit là une "abdication" du critique. Il soulève un problème intéressant: peut-on faire œuvre de critique en publiant un choix de citations? Ajoutons que Charles du Bos a fait beaucoup plus, comme le démontre la suite de l'étude de Bertocci.

La partie essentielle de l'ouvrage est consacrée aux "entretiens" poursuivis par Charles du Bos avec les grands écrivains anglais, entre autres Walter Pater, Shelley, Keats, Byron, George Eliot, Thomas Hardy et quelques contemporains: May Sinclair, Maurice Baring et Charles Morgan. Étude érudite, pénétrante, aussi complète que possible, méthodiquement divisée selon les lignes maîtresses de la pensée de du Bos: spiritualité (Part 3, "Poetry and Poets"), sens de la vie (Part 5), culte de la beauté (Part 6). Un chapitre entier, et c'est justice, est consacré à Walter Pater qui a eu tant d'influence sur Charles du Bos. Byron fait également l'objet d'un chapitre spécial. Comme l'ouvrage principal de du Bos sur Byron, *Byron et le besoin de la Fatalité*, fut publié en 1928 il est intéressant de reprendre les conclusions de Bertocci (chap. XII, "An Animal of the Higher Species: Byron") et de les comparer à sa forme définitive avant d'être

¹ *Journal*, tome IV, 1948 (Paris, 1950).

remis à l'éditeur. Bertocci écrit que *Byron et le besoin de la fatalité* est "the most sustained of du Bos' analyses" (p. 168). Du Bos inscrit dans son journal d'octobre 1928: "Byron, dans mon expérience et dans ma production, aura figuré l'exemple majeur, opime, de ces situations où, d'une manière qui déplaît quelque peu à ma probité, je donne le change, où je touche le maximum de bénéfice, où je suis d'autant plus brillant qu'ayant moins approfondi. Comme par ailleurs, si à l'excès je me suis fié ici à mes seules impulsions, celles-ci cependant ne m'ont point trahi et m'ont peut-être permis d'accorder plus à Byron qu'il ne me fut demeuré possible si j'avais creusé davantage,—le mal n'est pas grand: il l'est d'autant moins que si Byron n'avait pas été *visualisé* par moi sous ce double aspect du besoin de la fatalité et de l'animal humain de grande espèce, il n'eût peut-être pas présenté de quoi me retenir et m'attacher suffisamment pour obtenir de moi ce degré de réponse" (*Journal*, IV, p. 203). Comme l'écrit très justement Bertocci, "His purpose is neither biographical nor aesthetic," mais psychologique. Cette étude psychologique Charles du Bos l'a menée avec une attention scrupuleuse, il écrit dans son *Journal* que certaines découvertes l'ont obligé à refaire des chapitres entiers.

Un détail, relevé par Bertocci, illustre fort bien la manière de Charles du Bos. Il s'agit de "l'inqualifiable lettre" du 9 novembre 1812, lettre dont on ne possède pas l'original mais qui fut publiée par Lady Caroline Lamb dans son roman à clef, *Glenarvon*. Bertocci écrit à propos de Byron et de Lady Caroline: "He never loved her, yet the letter written to Lady Caroline by Lady Oxford, Byron's next mistress, remains one of the ineffaceable blots on Byron's escutcheon. His wanting Lady Oxford to be present in his final interview with his former mistress, Du Bos is persuaded, is pathological in its sensationalism." En réalité, d'après le *Journal*, la lettre ne fut pas écrite mais inspirée par Lady Oxford. Charles du Bos nous dit que sa première réaction fut de condamner le procédé de Byron. Un examen attentif de la correspondance le fit revenir sur son idée. C'est pourquoi Bertocci peut conclure, "the lady's actions and that of her family, while not justifying Byron's conduct, made it almost inevitable." L'intérêt du *Journal* est de nous montrer comment le critique est arrivé à ses conclusions. L'attitude de Byron lui paraissait d'autant plus étonnante que, vers la même époque, Lady Caroline écrivait à Medwin qu'elle recevait presque chaque jour des lettres amoureuses et tendres. Une lettre de Byron à Lady Melbourne, datée du 13 septembre 1812, mit Charles du Bos sur la piste. Dans cette lettre Byron dit à Lady Melbourne: "In the meantime I must and do write the greatest absurdities to keep her gay, and the more so because the last epistle informed me that 'eight guineas, a mail, and a packet could soon bring her to London,' a threat which immediately called forth a letter worthy of the Grand Cyrus or the Duke of York, or another hero of Madame Scudery or Mrs. Clarke."² Cette lettre ainsi qu'une autre envoyée à Lady Melbourne le 9 novembre 1812 provoque les réflexions de Charles du Bos. Suivons son raisonnement. Il affirme que: (1) les lettres à Lady M. prouvent non seulement la sincérité des humeurs mais la sincérité dernière de Byron. (2) Byron est légitimement excédé. "Il est indispensable de faire un droit à ce point," ajoute du Bos, "ce qui me fait un devoir d'en retarder la rédaction jusqu'à ce que je sois tout à fait au net quant à ma position personnelle à ce sujet." (3) La tactique de Byron est dictée par Lady Melbourne. (4) Il (du Bos) a fait la partie trop belle à Caroline. "... Mon indulgence illimitée, mon caractère même de partisan toutes les fois où il s'agit de la femme passionnée et malheureuse, ce besoin, quand les femmes sont en cause, de donner raison au

² Voir *Byron, A Self-Portrait*, ed. Peter Quennel (London, 1950), I, 143.

maximum à l'être qui aime, ont eu ce résultat que j'ai faussé la balance, et qu'il importe de rétablir l'autre plateau." Quoi qu'il lui en coûte d'efforts, il doit chercher la vérité sur Caroline; il y a, dit-il, des moments où la femme se disqualifie par son insistance autant que l'homme par sa franchise brutale. Il conclut, "Enfin, on n'a jamais le droit de pécher contre la lumière, pas plus dans un livre tout profane que dans l'ordre religieux de la grâce, et pour l'éviter, je n'ai pas le droit de brusquer les opérations" (*Journal*, IV, 216). Voilà un passage qui éclaircit le paragraphe que Bertocci consacre à Lady Caroline en même temps qu'il prend la méthode de Charles du Bos sur le vif.

Un autre détail montre le flair de Charles du Bos. Bertocci note que la publication de *Life and Letters of Lady Byron* par Ethel Colburn Mayne, qui aurait pu faire grand tort à la réputation de clairvoyance du critique, "brought largely confirmation and triumph" (p. 189). Considérons maintenant les limites que du Bos a données à son étude sur Byron. Bertocci note que "The analysis ends with Byron's departure for Italy, after *les invariants de Byron* have been determined" (note, p. 168). Du Bos explique avec précision pourquoi il a arrêté ses leçons au moment du départ d'Angleterre, "c'est parce qu'à partir de ce moment-là il ne lui arrive plus rien à proprement parler, il restitue ce qui lui est arrivé : aux données vécues se superposent alors les éléments mythiques. Indiquer aussi, s'il y a lieu, qu'en un sens très général, et qui débordé infiniment le seul cas de Byron, il est un temps pour vivre, il en est un autre pour créer et qu'il est rare que les deux opérations se produisent avec simultanéité." Une publication récente confirme le jugement de Charles du Bos. La marquise Iris Origo a pu avoir accès aux lettres de Byron à Teresa Guiccioli et les a éditées.⁸ Quoique le style de ces lettres demeure admirable, leur contenu est insignifiant; on n'y trouve rien qui ait pu ajouter un élément nouveau à l'essai de du Bos.

La lecture du *Journal* pourrait également permettre d'ajouter quelques compléments au chapitre XVII, "The Sense of Transcendence," où Bertocci examine les études de du Bos sur May Sinclair, Maurice Baring, Hope Mirrlees et Charles Morgan. On trouve dans le *Journal* l'explication de l'attachement de Du Bos à May Sinclair : "il y a entre elle et moi un tel accord quant à la façon, si je puis dire, de *sentir globalement la vie*, que je réponds à toute indication de ses livres" (cf. Bertocci, p. 9, "Du Bos' orientation toward foreign literatures, though motivated by a personal need, worked in the direction of a *broadier humanity*"). De même on pourrait utilement comparer le paragraphe consacré par Bertocci à Charles Morgan (notamment p. 225) et les pages 28 et 29 du *Journal*.

Après avoir lu le *Journal* on ne peut que penser que l'ouvrage du Professeur Bertocci apparaît comme un travail essentiel qui honore le lettré qui l'a écrit et rend le plus grand service à Charles du Bos puisqu'il invite à le lire. Nous pensons néanmoins que ce n'est qu'une première étape. La publication complète du *Journal* devrait permettre d'analyser avec plus de précision encore la méthode de du Bos; nous avons essayé d'en donner un exemple. Ensuite une autre étude s'impose, une étude qui n'isolera plus les jugements de du Bos sur la littérature anglaise mais qui les replacerait dans l'ensemble de son œuvre, qui mettrait en valeur l'intention suprême que le critique a révélée dans *Qu'est-ce que la littérature?* : chercher dans l'œuvre d'art la part d'éternité et de divinité qu'elle renferme, unir le culte du Beau et la foi en Dieu. Charles du Bos, critique chrétien, critique mystique, quel beau sujet! Soyons reconnaissants au Professor Bertocci d'avoir si bien ouvert le chemin.

RENÉ PICARD

Veneux-les Sablons

⁸ Iris Origo, *The Last Attachment* (London, 1949).

FRENCH PRECURSORS OF THE CHANSON DE ROLAND. By Mario A. Pei. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948. xiv, 105 p.

Am Anfang der französischen Literatur stehen bekanntlich kirchliche Dichtungen: die Eulaliasequenz (Ende 9. Jh.), die Passion, das Leodegarleben und das Alexiusleben. Diese Denkmäler für das Problem der Entstehung des altfranzösischen Epos fruchtbar zu machen, ist Peis Anliegen. Er vergleicht sie in sehr sorgfältiger Weise mit dem Rolandslied, indem er Versbau, Syntax, Wortschatz, Stil, Thematik durchgeht. Manche der aufgewiesenen Gemeinsamkeiten haben freilich keinen Beweiswert: z.B. die Feststellung, dass jusque (tres que) oder morz est oder vendre cher in mehreren der untersuchten Texte vorkommt. Anders liegt der Fall mit velit-nolit (Pei, p. 13). Das ist ein Versfüßel lateinischer Herkunft (vgl. meine Nachweise in *ZRPh*, 1944, 277 und *Rom. Forschungen*, 1948, 425). Sein Vorkommen in Alexius und Roland beweist, dass die Verfasser mit lateinischer und mittellateinischer Dichtung vertraut waren. Ähnliches gilt von der Litotes (non amare Pei, p. 27 und *ZRPh*, 1944, 277). Auch der Vergleich "schwarz wie Tinte" (Pei, p. 29) lässt sich mlat. belegen (*ZRPh*, 1944, 279). Dass die anticipatio (griechisch: promanteusis) nur im Roland vorkommt (Pei, p. 30), erklärt sich einfach daraus, dass sie seit Homer unentbehrliches Requist der Epik ist (*ZRPh*, 1944, 277). Ebenso die von mir so genannte cernas-Formel la vedissiez (Pei, p. 32 und *ZRPh*, 1944, 275). Ueber die epischen Formeln "wem nutzt das?" (Pei, p. 34) und die mit "Gott!" beginnenden Ausrufe (Pei, p. 33) vgl. *ZRPh*, 1944, 275. Dass Engel, Wunder, Himmel und Hölle, Gebet usw. den Texten gemeinsam sind, bedurfte eigentlich keines Nachweises, trägt aber auch nichts aus. Das gilt auch von der weltlichen Thematik. Den Beweis für die Kontinuität ("a line of literary continuity... from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries"—p. 102) konnte Pei nicht erbringen. Ein Heldenepos ist eben keine Heiligenvita und kann—trotz Faral, Wilmotte u.a.—nicht aus diesem entstehen. Trotzdem sind die Zusammenstellungen Peis dankenswert. Denn sie machen auf manches gemeinhin Uebersehene aufmerksam und sie sind der Ansatz zu einem Thesaurus des ältesten Französisch, der freilich alles buchen müsste und auch die lateinischen Parallelen heranzuziehen hätte.—Kontinuität im Sinne des biologischen Evolutionismus ist bei geschichtlichen Prozessen nicht immer zu erwarten. Sie verlaufen oft diskontinuierlich und werden bestimmt durch schöpferische Taten des Einzelnen. Eine solche Tat war die Terzine Dantes. Eine solche Tat war auch die Schöpfung des Grossepos durch den Rolandsdichter. Die letzte und beste literarhistorische Würdigung der von Pei behandelten Denkmäler findet man bei Ph. A. Becker, *Vom Kurzlied zum Epos* (1940), pp. 81 ff.

ERNST ROBERT CURTIUS

Bonn

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Albrecht, Erich August Gottlieb. *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Eighteenth Century German Lyric Poetry, 1680-1740*. Baltimore, 1950. 110 p.
- Arland, Marcel. *Lettres de France*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1951. 315 p.
- Atkinson, Geoffroy. *Les Idées de Balzac*. Geneva: Librairie E. Droz, 1950. 5 vols.
- Bailey, D. R. Shackleton (editor). *The Satapancasatka of Matrçeta*. Sanskrit Text Tibetan Translation and Commentary and Chinese Translation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951. xii, 237 p.
- Baym, Max Isaac. *The French Education of Henry Adams*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951. xiv, 358 p.
- Berger, Kurt. *Barock und Aufklärung im geistlichen Lied*. Marburg: Hermann Rathmann, 1951. 241 p.
- Berger, Kurt. *Das schöpferische Erleben des lyrischen Dichters in der Nachfolge Goethes*. Marburg: Hermann Rathmann, 1951. 131 p.
- Blum, Hermann Theodor. Oliver Goldsmith: Eine Studie über die Anfänge seines Humors. Konstanz: Echo-Druckerei, 1951. xi, 115 p.
- Brown, Alec (trans.). *The Tolstoy Home: Diaries of Tatiana Sukhotin-Tolstoy*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951. 352 p.
- Cordié, Carlo. *Due epigoni del simbolismo francese: Albert Samain e Louis Le Cardonnell (con lettere e documenti inediti)*. Milan: Paideia, 1951. iv, 272 p.
- Cornell, Kenneth. *The Symbolist Movement*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951. x, 217 p.
- Downer, Alan S. *Fifty Years of American Drama 1900-1950*. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1951. x, 158 p.
- Eustis, Alvin A. *Hippolyte Taine and the Classical Genius*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951. 63 p.
- Evans, Dorothy Atkinson (editor). Jean Cartigny. *The Wandering Knight*. Reprinted from... the first English edition. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1951. liv, 161 p.
- Figueiredo, Fidelino de. *Estudos de literatura (Quinta Série: 1947-1950)*. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo, 1951. 246 p. (Universidade de São Paulo Boletins da Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras, Vol. CXXII, No. 7.)
- Fiumi, Lionello. *Poèmes choisis*. Brussels: La Maison du Poète, 1950. 79 p.
- Ford, Newell F. *The Prefigurative Imagination of John Keats*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1951. 168 p.
- Graf, Emil. *Die Aufnahme der englischen und amerikanischen Literatur in der deutschen Schweiz von 1800-1830*. Zürich: Juris-Verlag, n. d. 127 p.
- Gros, Léon-Gabriel. *Poètes contemporains*. Paris: Cahiers du Sud, 1951. 247 p.
- Kramp, Willy. *Les Pêcheurs de Lissau (Die Fischer von Lissau)*. Roman traduit de l'Allemand par Raymond Henry. Paris: Albin Michel, 1951. 319 p.
- Leo, Federico. *Literature Romana: Traducción ... por P. U. González de la Calle*. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo, 1950. xi, 292 p.
- Loomis, Roger Sherman (trans.). *The Romance of Tristram & Ysolt by Thomas of Britain*. New revised ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951. xxxv, 293 p.

- Mönnig, Richard. *Amerika und England im deutschen, österreichischen und schweizerischen Schriftentum der Jahre 1945-1949*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1951. 259 p.
- Müller, Siegfried H. Gerhart Hauptmann und Goethe. Goslar: Volksbücherei-Verlag, 1950. 112 p.
- Pinto, V. de S. *Crisis in English Poetry 1880-1940*. London: Hutchinson House, 1951. 228 p.
- Robert, Guy, and Georges Matoré (editors). H. de Balzac. *Un Début dans la vie*. Geneva: Droz; Lille: Giard, 1950. lxx, 253 p.
- Roos, Jacques. *Aspects littéraires du mysticisme philosophique au début du romantisme: William Blake, Novalis, Ballanche*. Strasbourg: P. H. Heitz, 1951. 460 p.
- Russo, Luigi. *Problemi di metodo critico*. Bari: Gius. Laterza & Figli, 1950. 331 p.
- Schmiele, Walter. *Englische Dichtung Deutsch: Blake, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, Keats, Rossetti, Morris, Swinburne, Yeats: mit den Urtexten*. Darmstadt: Eduard Roether Verlag, 1949. 231 p.
- Schyberg, Frederik. Walt Whitman. Translated from the Danish by Eva Allison Allen with an Introduction by Gay Wilson Allen. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951. xv, 387 p.
- Sloane, Joseph C. *French Painting between the Past and the Present: Artists, Critics, and Traditions, from 1848 to 1870*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951. xii, 241 p., 90 plates.
- Sorrento, Luigi. II "Proemio" del Marchese di Santillana. Milan: Carlo Marzorati, 1946. 136 p.
- Stauffer, Donald A. (editor). *The Selected Poetry and Prose of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*. New York: Modern Library, 1951. xxviii, 608 p.
- Stone, Edward Noble (trans.). *The Song of William: La Chançon de Guillaume*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1951. xvii, 109 p.
- Struve, Gleb. *Soviet Russian Literature: 1917-1950*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1951. xvii, 414 p.
- Taylor, Archer, and Frederic J. Mosher. *The Bibliographical History of Anonyma and Pseudonyma*. Chicago: Published for the Newberry Library by the University of Chicago Press, 1951. x, 289 p.
- Trubetzkoy, Nikolai. *The Common Slavic Element in Russian Culture*. Ed. Leon Stillman. New York: King's Crown Press, 1950. vii, 39 p.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The University of Bordeaux has recently established an *Institute of Comparative Literature*, directed by Professor Robert Escarpit. Books and periodicals are sorely needed to develop this new center; *CL* invites its readers to send gifts of appropriate publications to Professor Escarpit, Faculté des Lettres, 20 Cours Pasteur, Bordeaux, France.

Read *zapiski* for *zapiski* in Professor Poggioli's article on "Realism in Russia," p. 259, note 9, in the preceding issue of *CL*. The erroneous transliteration is due to a misprint, not to the author.





